Vol. XI., No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1921.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Creed of the Average Englishman .. .. Arthur Walker.	406
What is Modernism? .. .. Francis E. Powell.	412
Modern Churchmen and Foreign Missions ..	418
Why did not the Reformation come earlier? .. G. G. Coulton.	424
Creed, Confession of Faith, or Declaration of Purpose .. .. R. J. Shires.	438
Scoutcraft in the Church .. .. Philip Carrington.	441
The Archdeacon of Stafford's Conference ..	448
Book Notices:—	
Christianity in its Modern Expression ..	449
Dr. Glover's Latest Volume	452
A Saint of Modern Days	453
Broadways	455
Correspondence:—	
Modernism	456
The Deity of our Lord	457
Bishop Gore's Criticism of the Conference ..	458
A Simple Creed	459

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Miss E. M. ALLEN, M.A.
Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Right Rev. A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Mr. W. B. GORDON, M.A.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Principal F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt.
Miss D. NUSSEY.
Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D.
Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Principal Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Street Chambers, E.C.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10.
Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1921. Vol. XI

THE CREED OF THE AVERAGE ENGLISHMAN

FOR the last twenty years I have neither read a religious book nor opened a religious periodical; but, having seen in the daily Press many references, scathing and otherwise, of this year's Conference of Modern Churchmen, I had the curiosity to order the conference number of the *Modern Churchman* to learn at first hand what these supposedly revolutionary utterances really amounted to.

Quite against my expectation, I found myself profoundly impressed by what I read. I said to myself, 'There is hope for the old faith yet, when the experts are getting together and taking stock of the position.' Next, I fell to wondering as to the effect of these new ideas on the average educated man, and this speculation landed me perforce in a new and different stock-taking, namely: 'What is the creed of the average Englishman of to-day?'

First we must find our average Englishman, and see what he is like. We must regretfully cut out the whole noble army of churchwardens and Nonconformist elders, deacons and stewards; in short all the truly zealous must stand aside. They are the pith and marrow of the churches; but whether we like it or not, they are no longer representative of the average man of to-day, and still less the average man of to-morrow.

Far rather must we seek him among the ranks of the Sabbath breakers. On the Sunday you will find him golfing, motoring, cycling, bathing, or mountaineering. He loves to lie a-basking in the sun, and if there is no sun he often does not trouble to get out of bed. It must be said for him, however, that he is still more or less familiar with the interior of a church, and, being a decent, docile person, he may even attend regularly, when domestic politics lead him in that direction.

But there is nothing of a hair-shirt about him; his religion, what he has of it, fits him like an old golfing jacket.

One sample of the species is very like another, but it may be worth while to mention two distinct types.

Of the first it may be said that religion has never seriously inspired nor troubled him in any way whatever. He has probably imbibed a certain amount of dogmatic religion along with his Greek and Latin; and to-day it occupies in the same company the nebulous background of his mental activity. Possibly for a few days, whilst preparing for Confirmation or during a Revivalist Mission, he has felt a slight stirring, which may have developed in some cases into a sudden and acute fit of piety, just as some boys had painful swollen arms after vaccination, while others did not lose a day's cricket.

But vaccination and Confirmation, Revivalist Missions and German measles all leave the average schoolboy much as they found him; and before many years are over we re-discover him as the average Englishman, with a vaccination-mark on his arm and perhaps a Confirmation-mark on his soul, both of equal value, since he never gives a thought to either. For want of a better label we may call him the Sancho Panza of the party.

But there is also the Don Quixote, who arrives at the same goal by directly opposite ways. He is the enquiring spirit, who has tried every known method of navigation, every possible variation of sail and rigging, on his stormy passage. To gain a portrait of this second type, perhaps the Headmaster of Sherborne will pardon me for quoting from his most helpful paper the following words:

> 'I am cursed or blessed, or shall we say simply possessed, with an incurably sceptical spirit, so much so that I very rarely feel able to make a positive statement of fact and rarely hear one without wondering what proportion of error it contains.'

The Headmaster is to be congratulated in that he has not, like most of us, lost the keenness and zest of enquiry on the religious plane.

It would fill many pages to picture the spiritual adventures of young men in their pursuit of the one thing needful. But usually, and perhaps fortunately, our Don Quixote type is living all the time in the grip of the common round and daily task. Rome is as far away for him as Salt Lake City, so he can only grasp at those spiritual experiments which lie along his path, experiments which for him inevitably end in the agony of a choice between an honest but painful withdrawal and an easy but shameful hypocrisy. After one or two such experiences the iron enters into his soul and religion begins to taste sour in his mouth. Moreover, the young man's character is crystallizing; his '*Sturm und Drang*' period is nearing its end; the enquiring spirit begins to seek other channels. He has a place to make in the world, probably a mate to find and children to beget.

A day comes when he quietly shuts the book of his religious experiments and says:

> 'Nevermore will I give a thought to this wretched tangle of intangible mysteries; let the Priests and Parsons unravel it for themselves, I will have none of it.'

So the Don Quixote type finally drifts into the peaceful waters where Sancho Panza has been waiting for him all the time. The man who has enquired and thought too much joins up to the man, who has neither enquired nor thought at all. They have become one type; and that is the average Englishman.

What is his creed?

In actual practice one would never be able to dig down to it, so deeply does it lie buried under the things he must pretend to believe, to please his fellows, and the things he would like to believe, to please himself. So we must imagine ourselves to be endowed with a new super-ray which shall expose the man's soul even as the X-ray shows up his bones. Many of the truly pious would prophesy, I am sure, that our ray would show us nothing at all but a blank vacuum, an utter bankruptcy of

belief, in this poor undersized soul that we are talking about. Yet it is my strong conviction that right among the very roots of his being we should find a real creed, not a long one, but a very strong one, a very definite creed after all.

The average Englishman believes that there is a God, that He is our Father, and that He is merciful.

Why this is so and how it has come to be so I will leave to the experts, only suggesting that this creed was the kernel of Christ's message when he lived among men. Hence the publicans and sinners of these latter days are the unwitting inheritors of more than we are apt to think.

We have not quite finished with the average Englishman's creed, but it may be useful here in a long parenthesis to consider the question :

'Why, if he believes in God, does this fellow not go to Church, or if he does, why is he no good to the Church when he gets there?'

He does not go to church because, to put it quite baldly, he does not find church-going worth while. His whole life is an equation of values. He sleeps and eats and is paid in renewed strength; he spends that strength in work, and is paid in health and enjoyment. Even when he deals with the devil he always gets payment, though the change is likely to be short.

But when he goes to church, nothing seems to happen to him. He hears great argument about it and about, and goes out by the same door wherein he went. A chemist is not likely to do an experiment twice, where no reaction takes place; and the average man is tempted to follow the chemist's example.

Now, why is there no reaction? Clearly because the man is not *en rapport* with what is being said and done in the church when he is there.

There was once a bare-foot man, who wanted a pair of boots very badly. He went into a shop and asked for a pair; but the assistant said : 'My dear sir, we have long since given up keeping silly things like boots. All the best people are using our aeroplanes now and they have thrown their boots away. Jump on and be quick about it.' The man was getting frightened, but he had still enough pluck to falter : 'I don't know how to fly, and what is more I don't want to know how.

I want to walk, and I want a pair of boots.' Then the assistant called up his mates and they laid violent hold on the man, shouting: 'We will see that you are damned to all eternity if you don't fly.' But he slipped from among them, and was seen in that shop no more. He ran so fast and so far that the soles of his feet became thick and hard, and he finally forgot that he had ever wanted any boots.

Few average Englishmen feel the need of a church; and supply has a bad time of it when there is no demand, as the industrial world of to-day knows to its cost. Apparently our average man finds no more than ordinary difficulty in living a moderately decent life; his manners and morals are up to the required standard, and he does not thank the Church for them.

If he ever gives it a thought, many a man will remember his school playground as the place where he gained the first elements of a code, which, strengthened and developed in the rough and tumble of early manhood, now provides him with a rudder and an anchor in the conduct of his maturity.

Along this line of argument we may hear a plaintive bleat from the sheep within the true fold, to the effect that since our whole present-day civilization from top to bottom, even to the school playground, has been moulded, or at the least profoundly influenced, by organized religion, this same rudder and anchor are really the property of Mother Church; and our average man is an ungrateful thief in that he never comes to thank and pay her for them.

We acknowledge, sympathize, and pass on, only remarking that it is always difficult to exact payment from a debtor who is not aware that he owes you anything.

Having taken this brief glance at the highly unsatisfactory relations now existing between the Church and the sinner, whom she has set out to save, perhaps it will clear our vision, and we may even see a distant solution of the problem, if we go back and continue our exploration of the creed of the average Englishman.

Does he believe in Jesus Christ?

Yes; he believes that Jesus Christ once really lived on this earth. He admires and venerates that life; he also believes that the less we say about Jesus Christ the better.

He believes that His life, and especially His death, have been associated with so much mystery and His memory enwrapt in such fantastic jugglery, that there is no way for the plain thinking man but to steer clear and keep silence.

Consider the difference between the name of God and the name of Jesus Christ, as used in our everyday life and conversation. It is true that an Englishman may not call upon his Creator with quite the fluency and freedom with which the Oriental 'takes refuge in Allah'; yet in any solemn moment he may use the name of God without losing virility and effectiveness. On the contrary, his appeal may gain in gravity and force.

But if a man comes to us with the name of Jesus Christ on his lips, an inward monitor warns us that this is either a despicable hypocrite or a mawkish sentimentalist. If the first he must be watched, if the second he must be avoided. And the worst of it is that our instinct usually proves to be correct.

Further, if by some strange chance the name of Jesus Christ is mentioned in ordinary small talk, perhaps in a railway compartment or in a city restaurant, is there not an immediate lowering of the temperature, and a sense of discomfort, as if the speaker had been guilty of some indecency which must be glossed over in the least painful way possible?

That we should find it so difficult to talk about Jesus Christ is a strange result of all the centuries of Christian teaching. If Jesus Christ is the same to-day as he was nineteen hundred years ago, would He not exchange the sacred mysteries of the Eucharist and the emotional ecstasies of the Revival Meeting for His old place in the everyday life of the average man?

Whittier's wonderful line, 'We test our lives by Thine,' contains the essence of the possible practical help of Jesus Christ to the ordinary man; but how can he test his life by that of Someone whose very name makes him uncomfortable?

The personality of Jesus Christ no longer sheds a direct ray into the life of the average man. He is only living in that light in so far as it is reflected upon him through the ages that have gone to build up his social and spiritual heritage.

Here our investigation ends in a great blank wall, and the future of Christianity as a living force depends on finding the hidden doorway through it.

* * * * *

It is easy to despair, and difficult to hope, after such an examination of the ground as we have attempted. Yet we may find some solid comfort and reason for optimism if we look up and seek a fresh perspective.

More than half the ideas and things we hold as necessary to us to-day had their birth in the human mind not more than a generation or two ago. A page or two back we used the X-ray as a familiar illustration, but twenty-five years ago we had never heard of it. The X-ray had been waiting for us since the beginning of time, and we did not know that we wanted it, any more than the average man is conscious of a spiritual need.

But when we got the X-ray, was there any doubt about its welcome? In the pursuit of truth it is never too late to mend.

In Major Kaye's recent Cantor Lecture, he told us that our great scientists have to a certain extent mastered the lower and the higher octaves in the scale of light waves; but there are certain octaves in the middle as yet unexplored, their wave lengths being too small or too big for our present means of investigation. In the meantime, therefore, we have to wait for a new weapon of attack. Those are bold people to-day who would assert that the scale of religious truth has not its missing octave. On behalf of the average Englishman, let me say to the theologians and philosophers of the Cambridge Conference: 'Go forward; we are waiting for the new and joyous magic which shall come into our lives from that lost octave when it is made to speak.'

ARTHUR WALKER.

WHAT IS MODERNISM?

By the Rev. FRANCIS E. POWELL, Rector of Ladbroke, Co-editor of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers.*

THE term Modernism has come so much before the British public during the last few weeks that the publication of a short series of extracts dealing with different aspects of Modernism may be found not only of interest, but of use.

It will, we believe, be apparent from a perusal of these extracts that Modernism does not stand either for a set of negations or for a set of new dogmas, but for a new spirit and modern methods in the study and teaching of religion and ethics. The reading of these excerpts may open the eyes of some to see Modernism where they have not hitherto seen it, and to hear perchance the first stammering utterances of the Modernist on the lips of those who are most fiercely denouncing it.

I. *What Modernism Means.*

1. Modernist and traditionalist are agreed as to the spiritual verities or realities which the creed of the Church affirms.

DR. BETHUNE-BAKER.

2. The underlying principles of Modernism . . . are four:—(1) Religion must be distinguished from theology, faith from creed, the content of revelation from the form in which it is embodied at any given time. (2) Religious truth is to be tested and verified by experience. [(i) Not individual, but that of the Christian community; (ii) and which, while infinitely various, presents certain uniform features, *e.g.* power to overcome temptation, consciousness of forgiveness, peace, hopefulness, capacity for love and service in fellowship with fellow-believers, etc.; (iii) and that its source is contact with the living Christ.] (3) In so far as it can be shown that the experience which verifies religious truth has arisen out of and been caused by the occurrence of any event in the past, the historicity of that event is also verified by that experience. (4) Unless it can be shown of an alleged event in the past that it caused this experience, and that without it the experience would have been impossible, belief in the occurrence of that event cannot be regarded as essential to the faith, however deeply embedded in tradition it may be.

R. F. CARDALE.

3. It is not easy to find a name for the modern broad school. The term liberal has predominantly a political meaning. The term broad may indicate mere laxity and indifference. Modernist also is unsatisfactory, for what is modern is by no means always in the line of progress. And the Roman Curia has attached the term to a circle of beliefs which seldom, if ever, was found in the mind of a single thinker: it has created a sort of clothes-horse on which to hang any views which it regards as dangerous. But we must reflect that nearly all party names were originally the invention of enemies, including even the name Christian, and we may hope to rescue the term Modernist from ignoble use. Prof. P. GARDNER.

4. Modern thought changes our theories, but not the facts, of our spiritual life; alters our scientific, historical and philosophical outlook, but leaves our personal relation to Christ untouched. J. T. NEWTON.

5. The suggestion that all creeds may be equally true, or work equally well, is no part of the faith of Liberalism. DEAN RASHDALL.

6. Modernism is a certain attitude of mind corresponding to our times; it is a tendency of thought rather than a body of doctrine; a vitalizing spirit making all things new rather than a full-grown and completed theology; an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed. NEWMAN SMYTH.

7. Modernism is the revolt far less of the enslaved intellect than of the violated moral and religious sense. GEORGE TYRRELL.

8. By a Modernist, I mean a Churchman of any sort who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion, and the essential truth of modernity. GEORGE TYRRELL.

9. The Modernist, alive to the demands of truth and reality, claims the right to give the creeds an honest symbolical interpretation. His reverence for the old faith is enhanced and not weakened by his respect for modern truth and the newer light. While faithful to the Christian spirit, he refuses to ignore the progress of knowledge, the results of honest criticism, and the evolution of human experience. He believes that Christianity possesses both an eternal and a progressive element, and that its ideal lies in the future as well as in the

past. The Christian spirit will never die, but it may leave *our* forms and *our* institutions to assume new forms and build up new institutions, more serviceable to life.

10. The hot emotion of one generation is the cold authority of the next . . . The centre of gravity has shifted from authority to experience—its watchword is *Confiteor*, not *Credo*.

Miss Jane Harrison.

11. What if truth is something which we can grasp only in approximation, which can only be presented to the human mind in forms which are imperfect, so that each generation, and each individual has to struggle to pierce, as it were, through the form to the underlying reality? Religion—to take a single manifestation of truth—may be regarded (though this is but one way of looking at it) as conversation between the Heavenly Father and His children. But that conversation is not carried on without difficulty, or without effort on the part of the children. It is their natural but mistaken instinct to try to find some way of escaping that difficulty or effort. For the striving of the Spirit in personal religion they have tried to substitute an infallible Church, an infallible Bible, an infallible historic Jesus. But what if the desire for infallibility is altogether wrong? All these have failed us, and we are driven back to a living religion of Communion with God, without the intervention of any other guide claiming to be an infallible substitute for personal effort. Dr. Kirsopp Lake.

II. *The Modernist Aim and Object.*

1. It is not a minimum of orthodoxy we want, it is a minimum of superstition and a maximum of truth.

Dean Page Roberts.

2. Religion has two functions to fulfil: to furnish some explanation of man's relation to and destiny in the Universe, and to offer practical guidance in life. If its explanation of the Universe and of the operating forces therein is being increasingly discredited by facts, its guidance of life must be weakened. One of two things must therefore happen. Either the whole Christian position must be re-stated, or the world will turn away from Christianity. But spiritual progress, with so millenial a past, is bound to continue, for the history of mankind is felt to be an ordered if chequered process which is tend-

ing to the realization of a destiny as glorious as it is definite and unique. F. E. Powell.

3. Modernism is based upon evolution in science and critical method in history; and it demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge, and restated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age. Prof. P. Gardner.

4. The two great contemporary tasks before Christendom are, to separate the transient from the permanent in the Christian religion, and to evolve a social system which is a worthy embodiment of the essential principles of Christianity. F. E. Powell.

5. Modernism does not wish to raise up new difficulties; it merely attempts to meet the difficulties which have already been raised by science and history. T. F. Royds.

6. If men have but faith, not in formularies, but in the guidance of life—they come back to all that seems lost and find in it new and greater values. To the Church—and find in it a community of men who in every age have known best, and described best, what religion was to them. To the Bible—and find in it a collection of writings which have given classic expression to some of the secrets of spiritual life. To the historic Jesus—and find, not an infallible escape from all those 'modern difficulties,' which are their own for them to solve, but a guide who shows them the ultimate values of life, lifts them—if only for a moment—above the details of daily duty, and reveals to them the eternal verities, in order that they may return to the work of the world and the responsibilities of life, and work out the problems of this 'interim' existence in the light of the vision which they have seen. Dr. Kirsopp Lake.

7. The great aim of the Modernist quest is the unification of thought. . . From the Reformation onwards, with the insistence upon verbal inspiration on the one side, and with the development of the natural sciences and of a purely lay philosophy on the other, there was for a long time an increasing divergence between theology and secular thinking . . . Only with the rise of Modernism can it be said that the frank and full unification of secular and religious thought has come to be freed as a definite ideal . . . So far from setting a premium

upon learning, the tendency of the Modernist is all the other way. He regards the creeds as products of excessive intellectualism. What he wants to do is to get out of the grooves of these over-minute and sometimes superfluous definitions . . A great deal may remain as a matter of feeling rather than of words; in Wordsworth's sense, 'We feel that we are greater than we know.' Dr. SANDAY.

8. The first Modernist bishop who stays in his place, forms a Modernist chapter and diocese around him, and fights the fight where he stands, will do more for liberty and faith in the Church, I now sadly believe, than those scores of brave 'forgotten dead,' who have gone out of her for conscience sake.

Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD.

9. Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously to re-fashion Christianity, not outside, but *inside* the warm limits of the ancient Churches to secure not a reduced but a transformed Christianity. Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD.

III. *The Opposition to Modernism.*

1. It is not faith, but a denial of faith, to suppose that all was fixed finally and for ever by the close of the fourth General Council or by the sixth century or by any other. If we can commit blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, surely we shall be doing something very like it if we deny that He is speaking through God's Church in the twentieth century.

Dr. J. N. FIGGIS.

2. All things are in flux and woe to him who would dam the water of life. Language builds the dam and consecrates it. Religious terminology often bars religious reconstruction.

Miss JANE HARRISON.

3. We are sometimes charged with offering the people mere negations. Nothing can be further from the truth. We know that the demands which our religion makes upon us are as positive and as searching as any demands can be, extending as they do to a complete submission of every act, word and thought to the obedience of Christ . . . It is because what we long for is not the prosperity of a corporation, but the coming of the Kingdom of God, that our cause is sure of victory.

DEAN INGE.

4. Let Rationalists expose freely the absurdities of orthodoxy, but let them remember that the high-minded and cultured liberal theologian is going to be their doughtiest opponent.

The Literary Guide, organ of the Rationalist Press Association.

IV. *Modernism in the Past*

1. Modernism is not new, it is eternal. Erasmus was a Modernist in the sixteenth century, as Sabatier and Tyrrell were Modernists in the nineteenth century. Robertson Smith was a Modernist in Presbyterian Scotland, just as Mr. Montefiore is a Modernist, among the Jews to-day, in his crusade for the inclusion of Jesus among the prophets of Israel. Every soul that is alive is a Modernist soul. How else can it be alive? For the spirit that is vital cannot be imprisoned in the letter which is dead. The spiritual facts are eternal, but the interpretations are human, temporary and changing:

> 'They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.'

A. G. GARDNER.

2. St. Thomas Aquinas (1225—1274) sought to reconcile Aristotelian philosophy with the Christian faith, and was the greatest Modernist of the thirteenth century. In 1228 Pope Gregory IX condemned this Modernism, but within a few years he was compelled to retract his condemnation. And in 1883 Pope Leo XIII allowed the publication of this Thomist Modernism under his auspices. So that to-day we find the Roman Church defending the now *old* Modernism against the new! Leo XIII tried to run the new wine of Modernism into the old Catholic bottles, but his narrow-minded successor, Pius X, thought it would destroy the old wine-skins, or at least the principle of authority which is the very foundation of the Roman Catholic Church. ARCHDEACON LILLEY.

3. Modernism in the Church of Rome failed; the disease had gone too far to be arrested. With us it is not so. And a religious school which thinks the thoughts and speaks the language of its generation—it is the distinctive feature of Liberal theology that it does both—is not only not sterile: its activity is an essential condition of the well-being both of religion and of the Church. *The Nation.*

MODERN CHURCHMEN AND FOREIGN MISSIONS

By a Missionary in the East.

IT is often said, especially by those who view Modernism with disapproval, that Liberal Churchmen have failed to take their fair share in the work of the Church overseas. There is, I think, a certain amount of truth in this contention. It is true that individual instances can be cited in which foreign missionaries hold views which are frankly (sometimes extremely) modernist. But still the fact remains that, while other schools of thought have organised their own distinctive Missionary Societies, there is (as far as I know) no Liberal Churchmen's Missionary Society, and on the platforms at missionary meetings Liberal Churchmen are, on the whole, less represented than other schools of thought.

Now if this is so, it is a matter which calls for serious consideration on the part of Liberal Churchmen. For there can be no doubt that the missionary enterprise is one of the 'live elements' in the Church of to-day; and the missionary call appeals to many of the best of the Church's young men and women who are but little attracted by 'Church work' at home. 'Edinburgh 1910' and 'Glasgow 1921' have stimulated and focussed some of the best and most progressive thought of the rising generation, and have opened the eyes of many to new visions of the scope and possibilities of the Christian Gospel.

If any section of the Church is not fully responsive to such lines of progress in thought and action, it will be in danger of losing some of the best of its younger adherents, and its enemies will be quick to suggest that the absence of missionary enthusiasm denotes a lack of the spirit of heroism and self-sacrifice. This charge has often been made, in the hearing of the present writer, against Modern Churchmen, by members of other schools of thought.

Yet, whatever be the true explanation, it is certainly not due to any lack of courage, or an unwillingness to endure hardship. No school of thought has had a finer record of readiness to risk persecution for the truth's sake. Men who are spiritually the children of Churchmen like Colenso and Maurice are not likely to refuse a call because of any desire for ease or safety.

If Liberal Churchmen are, as a whole, less responsive than others to the call of the foreign mission field, it is not because they fear its hardships; but, it is either because they are not convinced of the pre-eminence of its claim, or else because there are certain obstacles which stand in their way. And both of these are, I believe, real factors in the situation.

First, there are many Liberal Churchmen who are honestly *not* convinced that the 'Missionary call' ought really to take precedence at the present time over the claims of service in England. They are intensely conscious of the gravity of the situation in the English Church at home. They believe that unless Liberal Churchmen are strong enough to keep open the avenues for free thought within the Church, the forces of reaction may well win the day, with results disastrous both to Church and State. It is difficult for them to believe that any call can be more urgent than that which tells of the need for men of honest and liberal minds in the ministry and laity of the Church in England.

Then again, the Liberal Churchman is in many cases (not in all) a staunch 'British Nationalist.' He is keenly awake (more keenly, I think, than the average Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical) to the virtues of the British character; and the preservation of 'our national type of Christianity' is one of his dearest desires. But he knows (if he ever reads missionary literature) that many of the Churches in the Mission Field, at any rate in India and China, do not share his admiration for the British character or the Anglican polity; on the contrary, their desire is to develop their *own* national type of Christianity along lines as distinctive—and as *un-British*—as possible. To the Anglo-Catholic, brought up to venerate a Church with supernational authority, it is comparatively easy to accommodate himself to ideals which, at least, share his own contempt

for Anglicanism and its Articles; and the Evangelical missionary seems generally content to leave the new spirit of Oriental nationalism to seethe among the younger Christians, unguided and only mildly rebuked. But the Liberal Churchman, trained to regard England as the Mother of Liberty, and the English University man as the model of intelligent Christianity, feels instinctively that it would be hard for him to enter into the new spirit of the East, or to co-operate with those whose thoughts are so essentially different from (if not inferior to) those of the British people.

Again, I think many Modern Churchmen decline to consider the claims of the foreign mission field, because they are conscious that their own theological beliefs are in process of modification. That, too, may be a definite asset at home, where many, within and without the Church, are seeking for teachers who will *grow* and *move* as they teach. But is 'a gospel in the making' the right gospel to take to those who are at present outside Christian influence? So the Liberal Churchman asks himself, in hesitation—and meanwhile he decides to stay at home.

There is one other difficulty—that of the Missionary Societies. Most of these—either avowedly or in practice—represent some particular school of thought, with which the Liberal Churchman finds it hard in all respects to agree. Some societies, for instance, offer a wide latitude in matters of Biblical criticism, but expect from their missionaries a severe self-restraint in the matter of co-operation with other Churches; in other societies, this position is reversed. In the mission field, besides the authority of the Bishop, there is the authority of the local missionary secretary, and of the central 'Home Committee' in London; and any of these may intervene, if they feel that a missionary's teaching or practice is such that 'the Society's position is being compromised.' No wonder that the heart of the Modern Churchman quails before such a prospect.

Yet I would venture to urge that the claim of the foreign mission field is one which the Liberal Churchman, just because he *is* a Modernist, ought to consider, for the sake of his own school of thought, for the sake of the Churches overseas,

and indeed for the sake of the whole Church Catholic, abroad and at home.

I take the lesser motive first—the desire for the welfare of the Liberal school of thought in the Church of England. This can never be an ultimate end in itself; but those who (like the present writer) believe that without the witness of Liberalism and Modernism within its borders, the whole Church—and the cause of Christ's Kingdom—will suffer, must desire to see that school of thought strong and full of life and promise. And it seems to me that the charge of indifference to missionary work has sufficient truth in it to indicate a real weakness. If only a larger number of avowed Liberal clergy would offer for Christian service abroad, I believe the cause of Liberal thought in the English Church at home would gain far more than it would lose, and the moral and spiritual level of Anglican Modernism would be uplifted.

But this, after all, is a secondary consideration. The point upon which I would lay main stress is this—that Liberal Churchmen are *needed* in the mission field to-day, and that they can do there a work which no other men can do.

First, a Liberal Churchman is by training and temperament peculiarly well fitted to commend the universality of Christ, distinguishing that which is secondary from that which is essential, and able to clothe the central message in the language and phraseology suited to each age and people.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the urgency of the need for this, and I doubt if the Church at home has grasped the seriousness of the situation abroad, especially in the East. There, the older generation of Christians hold, for the most part, to the theologies of their first missionary fathers in the faith. The plenary inspiration of the Scriptures and the infallibility of the Creeds are taken for granted. In many of the non-graduate theological colleges, where older missionaries are in charge, these doctrines are still being taught, and accepted by simple village boys, who have no grounds for questioning what they hear, and repeat it glibly in pulpit and open-air Evangelistic service.

Then, side by side with these, are the young graduate Christians and their non-Christian college friends who are

'interested in religion.' These have been taught by younger missionaries, have read modern theological books, and have gained their religious inspiration, in many cases, largely from Student Camps and Conferences. They include in their number a good many capable young fellows, who are doing their own thinking quite apart from the European missionary or their elderly native pastors. And their thinking has already led them—wisely or unwisely—a good long way. Most of these whom the present writer knows intimately hold firmly to Christian ethical principles, but are sitting very loosely to historical Christian doctrine, and the Trinitarian formulas of the Creeds. They are strongly hostile to the present missionary policy of expecting all converts to leave their old community and join a 'Western Sect' (as they call the present 'Missionary Churches' in the East), and they advise their own friends simply to live a Christian life within their own community. They say frankly that they have more sympathy with the Liberal Buddhist, Hindu, or Moslem, than they have with their own 'Europeanized,' 'missionary-controlled' Christian kinsfolk; and in many cases they rarely, if ever, attend Christian worship or sacraments. Yet, judged by the 'Sermon on the Mount' or by St. Paul's list of the 'Fruits of the Spirit,' these young fellows are the very flower of the Church—clean, courageous, earnest, and throbbing with a strong love for Christ. But as things are drifting at present, they will soon be lost to the organized Christian Church—indeed, they will be its enemies—for they regard it as the stronghold of theological obscurantism and political imperialism.

Now the average orthodox missionary, be he Catholic or Protestant, knows little or nothing of this. He only sees that many of the most promising lads of his Church, especially those who have been to college, are irregular in their attendance at worship, and unwilling to undertake any form of service under the Mission. But of that which lies behind this he has only a vague suspicion; and indeed, how could it be otherwise? Is it likely that the boy returning from Student Camp should dare to tell his devout Anglo-Catholic priest that he has come to the conclusion that the Creeds are a bit out of date, or that he thinks that his college friend, who desires to

follow Christ, may quite well be left to use his own judgment whether to offer for baptism or to remain as a 'Christianized' Buddhist or Hindu? Or can you imagine the typical C.M.S. Missionary, who has passed the doctrinal tests of Salisbury Square, being willing to discuss frankly and placidly with a Christian Student whether Hinduism may not, after all, be nearer to Christ's ideals than the Thirty-Nine Articles? Yet these are the kind of questions which young educated Christians in the East are wanting to discuss; and unless they can find European missionaries who are willing to meet them, not by an appeal to authority (for which they care nothing), but with clear and careful reasoning and with a genuinely open mind, which has not prescribed its conclusions before commencing its argument, they will secede more and more completely from the existing Churches and leave these to draw their recruits from the ranks of the submissive and the credulous, who will accept without questioning the dogmas propounded by the European missionary.

Here, it seems to me, is a work which the missionary with modern views is peculiarly fitted to do, provided that he has not only width of mind, but also sympathy of heart. The mission field is no place for the intellectual aristocrat, who thanks heaven that he is not as the orthodox are; nor for the British Imperialist who thinks of the Lord as the special patron of John Bull; nor for any man who cannot listen patiently to the outpourings of crude and childish minds, and bide his time before he seeks to correct them.

But in many lands, young men, and women too, are hungering for teachers and fellow-workers who are liberal with the liberality that is in Christ. And if the Liberal School in the Church of England will provide the mission field with men and women who are wide-minded and great-hearted, desiring not to be spiritual scalp-hunters, trying to win their laurels by a long list of 'conversions' from one religious system to another, but rather to share with others and to learn from others in the search for truth and in the campaign for the Kingdom of God; then indeed we may look to see, both abroad and at home, the dawning of a wider and a deeper love.

WHY DID NOT THE REFORMATION COME EARLIER?

By G. G. Coulton, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THIS question need not raise so wide an issue as might appear at first sight; it does not necessarily involve the main points of difference between Catholics and Protestants. A convinced Royalist may, at this distance of time, admit that there was much to be said for the Revolution of 1642; and on the other hand, the most determined Republican may confess that Revolution to have been in many ways premature. In the same way, sincere and orthodox Catholics are often willing now to admit the general justification for a violent protest in the sixteenth century; while equally sincere Protestants will join hands with them in deploring much that was hasty and premature. We of the twentieth century are able to discuss the Reformation with a nearer approach to impartiality than any earlier generation could. We are even able to admit that the term itself, like all traditional and epigrammatic terms, is to some extent misleading. There is a sense in which the Reformation did in fact begin many centuries before Luther; there is another sense in which it has not yet begun.

The Reformation was a double movement, moral and doctrinal. There is some truth in the contention that it was economic also; no movement, however ideal, has escaped altogether from the influence of economic causes; and we have seen a learned Orientalist lately contending that Islam was mainly an economic affair.[1] But this is mere paradox; and it is equally paradoxical to put economic causes in the forefront of the Reformation. For centuries before Luther, all good Christians had looked forward to a moral change, and many had begun to anticipate doctrinal changes.

If the late Bishop Creighton had not begun his detailed study of the mediaeval Church with so late a period, I think he

[1] Prof. Becker in *Camb. Med. Hist.*, Vol. II, pp. 329—332.

would hardly have suggested, as he does sometimes, that Reformers and Conservatives could really have settled their differences by mutual consent in the sixteenth century. He seems never fully to have realized for how many centuries good men had suffered from the heart-sickness of hope deferred; or, again, how steadily the conservative resistance had stiffened during all those centuries, and how fatally the temporary success of forcible repression tempted the hierarchy to believe more and more in a policy of force and fraud. Against Creighton's opinion we may put Renan's: 'All the causes for a religious revolution existed already in the thirteenth century: all were stifled.'[2] Renan seems to treat it as rather a matter of chance; he goes on: 'What happened in the thirteenth century would have happened in the sixteenth, if Luther had been burned, and Charles V had exterminated the Reformers, and the Inquisition had succeeded throughout Europe as it succeeded in Spain and Italy.' We have to steer, therefore, between Creighton, who seems to think it an unlucky chance that the revolt came at all, and Renan, who ascribes its long delay to equally fortuitous events, and it will be profitable to look for satisfactory causes behind these apparent caprices of fortune.

We must as far as possible keep the moral and doctrinal threads apart. The moral revolt may be said to be full grown under St. Bernard at the beginning of the twelfth century; the doctrinal revolt does not reach similar maturity until we come to Wyclif, two and a half centuries later.

Even when Luther's doctrines alloyed the nobler appeal to freedom of thought with the lower temptations to antinomian laxity, the strength of the revolt was still rather moral than doctrinal; if the sixteenth century Reformers could have wiped out moral abuses from the Church as thoroughly as they wiped out many of the old doctrines, then there would have been no counter-Reformation, for none would have been needed. By far the earlier of the movements, and by far the more effective when the struggle came, was the desire for a moral change.

Some three generations before Luther, a word which seems plainly prophetic was forced from Jean Gerson, Chancellor of

[2] Renan: *Nouvelles études d'histoire religieuse*, 1884, p. 301.

the University of Paris, and perhaps the greatest Churchman of the fifteenth century:

> 'The Church is wasted with an incurable cancer; and the remedies do but make her worse.'[3]

From that time forward, similar cries of the heart were wrung from one great and loyal Catholic after another; yet there is only one point on which these later despairing utterances exceed St. Bernard's solemn protest of centuries before. St. Bernard had said:

> 'Isaiah's words are no longer true: "It shall be, as with the people so with the priest,"—for in our days, the priests are actually worse than the people.'[4]

The complaint is not strictly true; there never has been a time when the Christian priesthood was not in some degree superior to the average of the laity: yet the words were true in this sense, that the degradation of the clergy was the worst sore of the Church. On this subject, to the very end of the Middle Ages, there is a monotonous conformity among our witnesses; and it is this very monotony which creates the difference between St. Bernard's words and those of Gerson and his successors. This, then, is the first and most obvious cause for the delay of the Reformation. Europe had to wait for the cumulative effect of disappointment from generation to generation. Aspiration had to crystallize into resolve; the pious 'this must not be' had to become a brutal 'this shall not be.'

Here the steps are clearly marked. Bernard hoped, and had just reason to hope, for much fruit from the magnificent monastic reform of his day. The Cistercians, Premonstratensians, and other contemporary Orders promised to make a new world, not in the cloister only, but in the whole Church. Yet, before the end of that century, the Cistercians themselves had become fair game for satirists like Walter Map; and thus there died out, gradually, the greatest attempt to bring Benedictinism back to the actual Rule of St. Benedict. Early in the thirteenth century came a new wave of reform, led mainly by the Franciscans and Dominicans. Here, for a moment, was another new world; a monasticism as holy at St. Benedict's,

[3] *Opera* (1606), Vol. II, col. 556 *a*.
[4] *In Convers: S. Pauli*, Serm. I., 33.

yet far more directly in touch with the people. But that movement, again, had become undisguisedly decadent by the end of the century that had seen its birth. And, meanwhile, great reforming movements among the secular clergy had ended in equal disappointment. A single century saw four Ecumenical Councils (the fourth Lateran in 1215, the first and second of Lyons in 1245 and 1274, and Vienne in 1311). At each of these, Church Reform stood in the forefront of the programme. But the seventy reforming articles of 1215 bore so little fruit in practice that even orthodox contemporaries confess to have lost interest in them; and the opening sermon of Innocent IV, in 1245, practically admitted the failure of a generation earlier. The Church, he said, was suffering from five wounds like the five wounds of Christ; and 'the first wound was the evil conduct of prelates and their flocks.' Yet he himself in that same year, had given the Archbishopric of Lyons and the Bishopric of Valence, to be held together with other rich prebends, to Count Philip of Savoy, who was not even in Holy Orders. Another of his creations was Henry Bishop of Liège, who afterwards had two abbesses and a nun among his concubines, and boasted of having had fourteen children in twenty-two months. Grosseteste's sermon preached before that Council of 1245 is, if possible, an even more terrible indictment than John Colet's famous sermon before Convocation in 1511, which is often cited as the final decisive call to reformation.

The next Lyons Council, in 1274, was summoned by Gregory X, the best Pope since Innocent III. He spoke even more plainly to the assembled Fathers than his predecessors had done; 'the prelates,' he said, 'are the ruin of the whole world.' 'Reform yourselves,' he added, 'or I will deal summarily with you.' One act of signal justice he did perform, he insisted on Henry's removal from the see of Liège. But two years later Gregory died, leaving his work scarcely begun.

The fourth of these Councils, that of Vienne, dealt again with the question of morals. The official reports have mostly perished; there were good reasons for their disappearance. But two most important documents have long been known; the memoirs of two bishops, Guillaume Durand of Mende and

Guillaume le Maire of Angers. With the first of these I must deal in some detail.

Already in 1274 the Pope had hit upon the commonsense idea of asking a few trustworthy prelates to draw up memorials setting forth the most crying needs for reforms; two brief summaries from that year have survived; and these, together with the longer memorials prepared for Vienne, have all the historical value for their time which the *Cahiers* have for French social history in 1789. The writers, whose task is to detail the most urgent measures of reform, are thereby implicitly describing the most crying abuses of the Church in which they lived. And they differ only in fulness of detail; Guillaume Durand, who has written at greatest length, is explicitly or implicitly supported on every point of importance by the others. He shows us plainly that the evils of St. Bernard's day were, if not intrinsically worse in the world of 1311, at least more deeply ingrained by the inveterate custom of two further centuries. The whole book (for it forms a small 8vo. of 350 pages) may be summed up in one single plea; let the Court of Rome first reform itself, then the prelates, lastly the priests: thus the scandals of Christendom will be removed.

In some cases, the mere titles of the good Bishop's chapters speak volumes; here is one of them:

> 'Concerning the avoidance of the cohabitation of clergy and women; and against the keeping of brothels near churches, or hard by the lord Pope's palace in Rome; and that the lord Pope's marshall and other like persons should not take money from the harlots and brothel-keepers' (II. 10).

It is essential to note that at this point, 1311, we have not yet come to the Black Death, and are only in the very first years of the so-called 'Babylonian Captivity' of Avignon. Catholic writers of all schools have laid on those two events a stress which seems altogether unreasonable. They speak of the Black Death as a disaster which shook religion for centuries; their language not only implies, but almost goes so far as to say, that in 1349 the Almighty perpetrated a blunder so grievous that not even the Pope and the hierarchy have been able to make it good to this present day. It will be safer if we suppose that the Black Death affected religion just as it

affected other ideas, and the Church as it affected other institutions. Everywhere it blighted what was already moribund, and shook to its fall what was already tottering.

As to the 'Babylonian Captivity,' this was a matter so purely domestic to Pope and hierarchy that it is difficult to see any logical pretext for pleading it in extenuation of those later mediaeval abuses which no school of historians ventures to deny. In so far as the Church suffered from those seventy years of Papal rule from Avignon, it was by the choice of the Popes and their cardinals; in so far as these were dominated by French Kings, they themselves chose such subservience, as the lesser of two discomforts; and indeed it is German Catholics who generally plead this French domination as one of the causes of the corruption of the later Church, thus covering their theological retreat by an appeal to national prejudice. There is no single grave abuse of the sixteenth century which was not rampant long before the Black Death or the Avignon Papacy. The Black Death operated as a violent disinfectant which separates the dead tissues from the living flesh. The theory of special clerical devotion during that plague, which Dr. Jessopp started in England, will not bear a moment's comparison with the recorded movements of Popes and Bishops during those terrible months, or with the express testimony of the chroniclers, nearly all of whom were clerics themselves. The Black Death taught many people to look for religion outside the institutional Church, and it hastened that crystallization of the spirit of revolt which I have already described: that transition from 'these things must cease' to 'these things shall cease.'

We may here pause in our consideration of the moral revolt, and turn to the doctrinal. Naturally, they cannot altogether be separated; indeed, the moral necessarily involves something of the doctrinal. We can imagine the strangest doctrines securing age-long acceptance, so long as the society which preaches them works well. But, on the other hand, a moral revolt against any society must inevitably lead men to question its fundamental doctrines. This second movement may lag far behind the first; but, sooner or later, it must follow; and the two currents must to some extent coalesce. Our first noticeable landmark here comes in and about the year 1200; it is one of

the strangest of the phenomena of the Middle Ages; the teaching of Joachim of Flora. This Cistercian Abbot, whom Dante places in one of his most conspicuous heavens, and who wrote with the express or tacit permission of three consecutive Popes, worked out a theory of religious evolution which, followed to its logical consequences, would practically have suspended the hierarchical and sacramental systems. The world was to see three ages, of which the first two were already nearly spent. The Reign of the Father had stretched from Adam to Christ, 1,260 years. The Reign of the Son should also last 1,260 years; then the Reign of the Holy Spirit until the Last Judgment. The first had been the era of the Old Testament; the second of the New Testament; now would come the Everlasting Gospel; not a new book, but a fresh and more spiritual interpretation of Old and New Testament alike. Henceforth to the end, mankind in general would live the life which only religious devotees now lived; the world would be given up to voluntary poverty, prayer, and contemplation. In other words, the Church is not a vast static monument, but a tabernacle which humanity carries along on its march, to be pitched for worship at nightfall, and then to be moved onwards with to-morrow's dawn.

Here, then, we have a very startling theory; yet it kept within the bounds of official toleration, because it was too visionary to arouse the fears and the hostility of a court which was, above all things, practical. In the arts of statesmanship, Rome was by far the ablest, most experienced, most consistent of all mediaeval governments; that has been both its strength and its weakness. Popes understood better than any Tudors, better than any Walpole, the art of tolerating whatever did not directly threaten their authority, in order to exercise the full force of that authority whenever deeper interests were at stake. Joachism, fermenting among a small section of extremists in the Franciscan order, did indeed help to produce those heretical Fraticelli who were exterminated by the Inquisition; but, in general, it acted rather as a safety-valve for visionary enthusiasm. Yet a contemporary movement, far less revolutionary in its theories, but far more direct in its practical consequences, was recognized very early as an enemy of the

Church, and may be counted as a definite forerunner of the Reformation. A rich citizen of Lyons, Peter Waldo, was converted to a sudden interest in religion and paid a priest to translate for him into French, first the Gospels and Epistles which were recited at Mass, then the whole or large parts of the Bible, and finally 'sentences' from the Fathers. This marks an epoch. The desire to possess serious books in the vernacular had hitherto been gratified only in the case of a few nobles; now Waldo's action not only testified to a popular desire, but also gave an enormous further impulse to that desire. From this time forward, the people begin to find that the Church cannot give them all they want; and, when the people lives under an increasing sense of dissatisfaction, it may be said that revolution is already in sight. The Waldensian sect was not, at first, doctrinally dissident. Waldo differed from none of his fellow-citizens, except that he had now given his money to the poor and was devoting his life to reading and preaching the Gospel. It was only gradually that this preaching led him and his followers into conflict with the Church; and that conflict was hastened by the hostile attitude of the hierarchy towards lay preaching and the vernacular Bible, two things which were scarcely separable in practice and which the hierarchy took little pains to distinguish in their condemnation. In process of time, the Waldenses were driven out of nearly all the populous districts by the Inquisition and the Friars. Franciscans and Dominicans now gave the people enough religious knowledge to cut the ground away, for the time at least, from under the feet of those who desired the whole Bible; the large majority began again to feel that the Church was giving more than heresy would be able to give, and the small unsatisfied minority were exterminated by the Inquisitors. That was the rough result; but at each of these stages in Church history a leaven of revolt always remained working within the mass; the clock never went quite back to its former hour. And, when the Franciscan-Dominican reaction had spent its force, when at last the pious had become rather parasites than missionaries and the Middle Ages had no new religious orders of any importance to give to the world, then at last the two currents of moral and doctrinal revolt definitely coalesced in John Wyclif.

It is important to mark Wyclif's personal evolution; otherwise we shall miss his full significance in history. He began as an intellectualist, distinguished in philosophy beyond all his contemporaries at Oxford, the University which produced more original thinkers than any other of the Middle Ages. Only then did he pass on to theology, and only in the third place did he begin to come forward as a practical reformer. What led him to rebellion was what had ripened the world to listen to such a rebel—the gradual pressure of facts that could no longer be blinked, and of logical deductions which could no longer be avoided. That alone can explain how England, hitherto the most orthodox of mediaeval states of the first rank, suddenly became the most unorthodox. England hitherto had not needed the Inquisition; her few and sporadic heretics had been exterminated by the ordinary process of Church and State law working in harmony. Only for a moment had the mediaeval Inquisitors appeared amongst us, when the King of France was using the Pope to destroy the Templars throughout Europe; when in England it was impossible without torture to get the evidence which this scheme required; and when Edward II wrote back to the Pope that English law did not allow torture. The Pope replied that State law must yield to Church law, and that the English Templars who refused to confess must be subjected to the same pressure as their fellows on the Continent. By a threat and a bribe he broke down the King's opposition, and for that one moment only until Mary's reign the Inquisition appeared in England. We had no Inquisition in Wyclif's day, and in spite of Pope and Primate, Wycliffism dominated Oxford for some years.

If this man's influence was so great, it is because his thought had followed a course so natural and so inevitable that it exactly met the needs of his age. This was the ripe fruit of previous thinking generations; some men had planted, others had watered; and now God gave the increase. Wyclif was the first man of outstanding intellect and character who realized, from the experience of past efforts, that the Church would never reform herself from within. If he had lived in St. Bernard's time, he would probably have hoped with St. Bernard; in the early thirteenth century he would have hoped with St. Francis;

but now 'Poor Trust is dead; bad debts have killed him.' And then the Papal schism showed the practical weakness of Papal autocracy. To follow the true Pope is essential to salvation; but who is true Pope, and who is false, among these two (or even three) rivals? Saints themselves could not decide: the Roman Church has not officially decided to the present day, although historians, more rash, practically made up their minds long ago. Saints could not decide at the time—that is, at the time when eternal salvation or damnation depended on some decision. St. Catherine of Siena had no doubt whatever that Urban was the lawful Pope, and Clement the pretender. Her contemporary St. Vincent Ferrer not only decided in the exactly contrary sense, but proved with irrefragable scholastic logic that all who rejected his reasons, however excellent their intentions, would without doubt perish everlastingly.[5] This drove Wyclif to his final step. Thus Wycliffism was the real beginning of the end; it appealed to the man in the street.

Yet Lollardism was in many ways premature; again, it committed the fatal mistake of allying itself with politics; it roused the Government, which joined with the Church and drove it out of the field. After Oldcastle's revolt, no socially or academically distinguished man could be a Lollard and live; Lollardism was driven underground; Wycliffism seemed to have failed, as the Parliamentary revolt of 1642 seemed dead and gone in the years that followed 1660. But underground it yet lived on, nourishing itself on its vernacular Bible; and later, when the Bible readings of a group of Cambridge scholars brought them into contact with Luther's revolt, and the inn-parlour in which those men met, with its side-door into the present King's Lane, earned from this new Germanizing theology its derisive nickname of Germany; then a new growth had begun which not even the fires of Smithfield or Oxford could consume. At last, after all those centuries, religious radicalism had reached that stage of maturity at which the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

[5] In his little treatise *De Moderno Ecclesiae Schismate,* which was published at Rome in 1900, but withdrawn at once from circulation; I owe my sight of it to the courtesy of a friend.

And that, so far as one sentence will contain the truth, is why the Reformation had been so long delayed; only now, in the sixteenth century, did the people come in; and it is the people alone who can put the final seal upon any social compact. Mr. Herbert Paul, in a lecture at Oxford in 1904, pointed out how truly we may describe the crash of the hierarchy in England in the words in which Juvenal describes the fall of Sejanus. The Roman tyrant might, with impunity, decimate the Roman nobility by systematic judicial murders. Similarly Henry VIII lost little ground even through the murders of the Countess of Salisbury and Sir Thomas More. But when Sejanus was obliged to extend his policy, and to ravage wholesale among the people, then

> 'Periit, postquam cerdonibus esse timendus
> Coeperat. Hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.'

He had made himself an enemy of the people. Mrs. Partington found herself face to face with the Atlantic ocean. It was Mary's wholesale cruelties which ingrained the Reformation spirit indelibly upon the British people. Henry VIII's sequestration of the monasteries perhaps took him doctrinally further than he would otherwise have gone, but Mary's policy linked the moral and the doctrinal revolt indissolubly together. Nor is it by mere blind prejudice that the generality of men, ever since, have refused to consider these two questions apart. In the most strictly logical sense, the fires of Smithfield were a *reductio ad absurdum* of some most characteristically mediaeval doctrines.

For this is a point which, I think, has never been sufficiently emphasized, that persecution is the one thing which grew steadily worse during the whole period we are considering, from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. In many other ways, mediaeval society steadily progressed. Students are more and more inclining now to do justice to the fifteenth century; it lacked the great individual figures and the remarkable ideals of the thirteenth, but, under the decay of the forest trees, there was a steady advance of healthy undergrowth, and one cause of the Reformation was that the citizen and yeoman would no longer be satisfied with things which had been good enough for their forefathers. Education had certainly advanced, even

before the discovery of printing; there was a general slow advance almost everywhere; only the censorship, and the prison, and the stake for Nonconformity, had progressed in systematic cruelty while all else was moving in the other direction. It was like a cancer; the growth of certain tissues in a contrary sense to the natural growth of all other tissues: and from that cancer the mediaeval Church died.

I have tried to emphasize the extent to which the coming of the people was operative in the Reformation movement; there remains just one more point to note in that connection.

All this time there stood one formidable line of defence for the Conservatives. In monasticism, the Institutional Church was writ large; the monasteries and nunneries and friaries scattered over the land were so many blockhouses manned by a Papal militia. In the twelfth and early thirteenth century, these would have proved impregnable strongholds. But nine-tenths of the later monks, it may be safely said, had no 'call' in Bernard's or Wesley's sense; they had drifted into the cloister as men drift nowadays into the nearest means of livelihood. And these nine made it difficult for the tenth monk, the real monk, to keep his rule, not only by their weight of passive resistance, but often by deliberate persecution. Even the authorities, from the Pope downward, whittled away some of the most important disciplinary prescriptions; in the sixteenth century, monasticism seldom even pretended to a strict observance of the Rule, and the orthodox began to join the unorthodox in progressive disendowment. The orthodox witnesses to moral decay are far more numerous than even Froude or Lea realized: I hope this year to publish, not indeed an extensive collection, but a selection which will suffice to settle this point.

Socially also the monasteries had lost ground almost as much. Their interests had become bound up with those of landlordism, and they were thus doubly vulnerable when the new world began to shape itself. So long as their plunder had tempted great men only, they risked less; but gradually they had begun to tempt the middle and lower middle classes; and this is an aspect of the economic situation which has been too much neglected by those who love most to emphasize the economic side of the Reformation. It is only a partial truth to speak

of the spoliation of the monasteries as a victory of despotism in alliance with landlordism and squirearchy. From another point of view, it was a royal victory over one considerable section of landlordism and squirearchy, which had entrenched itself behind the profession of otherworldliness. From the fourteenth century onwards, popular revolts against landlordism had struck not at the landowners only, but at the abbeys also; and, if Henry VIII had spared the English houses, some later revolution would have found the monks ranged as definitely on the side of the landed and privileged classes as the French Revolution found them in other countries of Europe. But Henry, as we know, did not spare them. The political and economic temptations to their overthrow were overwhelming; at one stroke he could sweep away the most formidable Papal fortresses and replenish his exchequer and buy the support of a new landed class. The same temptation swayed the princes of Europe; and this disendowment of the monasteries not only emphasized the doctrinal breach with the Pope at the moment, but rendered later reaction almost impossible. It was the consummation and the perpetuation of the religious revolution.

I have said nothing of what is always sufficiently emphasized everywhere, the influence of the Renaissance and of geographical discovery. It is necessary to bear in mind also how political liberties had grown in most countries in Europe, and how inevitable is the reaction between political freedom and freedom of thought. In spite of the reactions towards despotism, which came especially in the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there was far more political freedom in the Europe of 1520 than in that of 1220; and the Reformation succeeded, roughly, in the districts where despotism had least hold—England and Scotland, Switzerland, Holland and the great cities of Germany.

To sum up, then; I think that Renan, in so far as he would have defended his *dictum* under cross-examination, made the mistake which has often been made in history from the other side; he looked only at the leaders and forgot the people. The whole inspiration of the Oxford movement of last century, seen at its best in Newman's historical writings, shows a similarly brilliant, but dangerously distorted image of the past. New-

man and his friends took the saints and doctors of the Church as types of their age; whereas the men who go down to posterity are often quite as truly rebels against their age, men of unquenchable idealism who stand out from a materialistic society, just as it is recognized that the Hebrew prophets owe much of their burning conviction to a reaction against the money-grubbing spirit of the Hebrew of their own day. Renan, therefore, looking only at the new-born University movement of the Middle Ages and at the visions of remarkable men like Joachim of Flora, forgot the dead weight of that inert mass amid which these men lived. The world in general has a better sense of what is possible in progress than even the greatest thinker has; it is for him to show the way and do what one man can to set the pace, but only society knows, and that only sub-consciously, how fast society can follow. It is of the essence of every great movement to be in one sense premature.

But this historical lesson of patience is not the only one for us to-day. In this particular field of human progress we may trace more directly, perhaps, than in any other, the superiority of character to mere intellect. Intellectual assent comes far earlier than constructive success, because it is so much easier to see a truth than to live up to it. Yet no movement can succeed until it has gained constructive force, nor survive any longer than that constructive force lives in it. Pre-Reformation history has a sobering moral for Protestants as well as for Catholics. Unless those who dissent from the religion dominant in the Middle Ages can agree sufficiently as to the conduct of life, and associate helpfully enough in terms of such agreement to rival the institutional and social force of Catholicism, large numbers of serious men and women will refuse to participate in a predominantly centrifugal movement; and it will be a healthy instinct which prompts that refusal. It is one of the first duties of idealists to be gregarious; those who forget this will influence the world less than their intellectual inferiors, and will note with just pain or unjust contempt that the multitude goes on bending the knee to other gods than theirs.[6]

[6] We regret that considerations of space required the elimination by the author of much interesting material in support of his conclusions.—Ed., *M.C.*

CREED, CONFESSION OF FAITH, OR DECLARATION OF PURPOSE?

By the Rev. R. J. SHIRES, Rector of St. Andrew's, La Tuque, P. Que., Canada.

THE cause of Christian Unity depends ultimately upon agreement; but agreement upon what? The Lambeth Report of 1920 suggests a fourfold agreement upon:

(1) The Holy Scriptures.
(2) The Nicene Creed.
(3) The Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion.
(4) The Ministry.

Nevertheless, as the question of the Ministry is apparently to be left over until the terms of union have been 'otherwise satisfactorily adjusted,' it would seem that attention should at present be directed to the securing of agreement in regard to the other three things. It is probable that there will be very little difficulty in securing the acceptance amongst Christians of the Holy Scriptures 'as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the ultimate standard and rule of faith'; neither is much trouble to be anticipated so far as the two Sacraments are concerned. The Creed would seem to be the real crux of the matter; and rightly so, because here we have to deal with a statement of our belief which all Christians should be able to accept in absolute sincerity, and without any mental reservation or equivocation whatever.

It is obvious that the acceptance of the Nicene Creed gives no guarantee of that unity which we seek, if the history of the past is a fair indication of its effect. Moreover, there are many sincere Christians who feel very strongly that they cannot honestly accept the Nicene Creed 'as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith,' if for no other reason than that it absolutely ignores the necessary Christian conduct. It used to be held that correct belief, as expressed in the Nicene Creed, was

of the utmost importance, because it would necessarily issue in right living. Nowadays it is recognized as a matter of actual experience that it is quite possible for a person to be extremely orthodox, and yet to lack that love which is the only true indication of effective Christian belief. The fact of the matter is that there is a great deal more in the Christian life than is expressed by any of the Catholic Creeds, and every Christian is really committed to beliefs which are not mentioned there. Our actions in the past seem to suggest that the acceptance of the Creed settles the whole matter, even though no one of the Creeds says anything about living the spiritual life, or of love to God or neighbour; nor is there any mention of a definite goal, as the objective of our Christian endeavour, towards which the dogmas of the Creed are to guide us.

To attempt to use the Creed as the test of a man's life is hopeless, as it leaves out of count altogether a great deal of practical Christianity. There are many who could not be counted other than Christian on the ground of conduct, who would probably fail lamentably were they required to pass a credal test.

There are some also who, on other grounds, could not wholeheartedly accept the Nicene Creed.

Yet with all this, it is certain that most people who are really trying to live the Christian life have very definite beliefs, and are deliberately shaping their conduct accordingly. They possess also a definite and, to some extent, common objective, which does, in fact, bind them much more closely together than any amount of agreement upon the acceptance of the Nicene Creed, and this because the practical issues of life are infinitely more real to us than the speculative. Most men like to have something definite to do. A common purpose, which presupposes a common creed, is much more effective than an agreement on a statement of belief which does not necessarily lead to practical action.

Our eyes are turned to the future, because of the experience of the past. Is it not possible, under such circumstances, to draft a declaration of faith and purpose for the future which shall spring out of, and be conditioned by, the heritage of the past? Would it not be very much to the point to follow the

example of St. Paul, and in his spirit to forget those things which are behind in order that we may press toward the mark? No one for a moment suspects St. Paul of denying or repudiating his past experience, but it is certain that he was looking to the future, speaking for the future, working for the future. For him the golden age was in the future, even while he recognized the glory of the past, and we seem to be in similar case. Without repudiating anything of the spiritual experience of the past, would it not be possible and practicable to leave the past as it is, and to draw up a declaration of faith and purpose which would serve for the present and the future?

It is obvious that there will have to be some agreement as to what we do believe, and some statement of that belief, and there seems to be no very good reason why it should not include belief in God's purpose for us and our work. Such a statement could, and should, be drawn up:

> '. . . . with love far-brought
> From out the storied Past, and used
> Within the Present, but transfused
> Thro' future time by power of thought.'

and should at least include the following Christian affirmation:

> That inasmuch as the real test of our Christianity is that our daily conduct shall harmonize with the will of God, as declared by Jesus Christ, through the power of the Holy Spirit, we therefore declare our intention of working together in a Christian spirit with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity:
>
> To improve and intensify our personal experience of God by the regular and faithful use of every means of grace.
>
> To live in such a way that men everywhere shall be able to take note of us that we have been with Jesus.
>
> To follow the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who will lead us into all truth.
>
> To promote harmonious relations with all men.
>
> To seek that unity which shall make us all one in Christ Jesus.
>
> To promote effective Christianity in the endeavour to make the kingdoms of this world the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

SCOUTCRAFT IN THE CHURCH

By the Rev. PHILIP CARRINGTON, Vicar of Lincoln, Canterbury, New Zealand, author of *The Boy Scout's Camp Book.*

WHY is it that we can easily get all the boys (and girls) we want to join the Scout movement, and yet our Sunday Schools get emptier and emptier? This was the task I set myself to solve when I took charge of a Sunday School after ten years' experience as a Scoutmaster. My Sunday School got emptier and emptier, less and less enthusiastic; my scouts kept on improving.

It wasn't a personal matter, because the same person was running both. It wasn't that scouting demanded less; it demanded more. It was simply that the Sunday School was dull; and as it is a voluntary institution, that is a fatal defect. As a Scoutmaster, I could also see certain errors of method which would have ruined any troop of scouts that adopted them. Let me sketch what they were:

1. It was a school. To attract boys and girls it is foolish to take the school as a model.

2. It used direct instruction. In the Scouts we set a boy something to do, and he learns by doing.

3. The boy or girl sat on a form or was drilled the whole time.

4. The will of the boy or girl was never enlisted at all, so there could never really be any discipline. There could be repression, but no real moral appeal.

5. There was no provision for finding out what the boy or girl wanted to do and carrying that out.

6. There was no enjoyable ritual.

7. There were no rewards, prizes having been abolished.

To sum up. The children were collected, drilled and instructed according to the ideas of grown-up people.

Now, I felt that Christianity need not be placed before children in this way. Christianity is an attractive scheme of life, and appeals to what is highest in a child, just as it appeals

to the highest in a grown-up. I felt that children would embrace Christianity just as they embraced scouting if they really saw it, and perhaps be even keener on it.

I accordingly stopped the Sunday School, told them I was tired of it, and that next Sunday we would start something new.

The next Sunday I told them about the Crusaders and the St. George's Cross, the St. John's Ambulance Association and the Red Cross, the meaning of the Cross and the duty of a Christian, and that we were now going to start a company called the Soldiers of the Cross. All were to enter it, as novices, by passing a test corresponding to the Tenderfoot Test in the Scouts, and on passing this every novice would receive his or her badge—a black cross in a black circle on a red ribbon.

The Novice Test was, and is, as follows:

1. Know the Christian Vow.

   I promise and vow.

   (*a*) To fight against sin, the world and the devil.
   (*b*) To be loyal to Christ and His Church.
   (*c*) To obey God's Law.

2. Know God's Law.

   (*a*) Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength. This is the first and great commandment of the Law, and the second is like unto it, namely:
   (*b*) Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

3. Know the Christian Signs and Salute.

4. Know the stories of these saints: St. Alban, St. Martin, St. Laurence, St. Perpetua.

The vow is, of course, the baptismal vow, but cast in simple language, introducing ideas already familiar to many children through the Scouts. After my introductory yarn came the patrol meetings. The classes were no longer classes, but patrols, each one named after a Saint; the patrols met under the presidency of their teacher to choose their name and to elect their leader. The leader takes charge of the patrol when it falls in, carries the patrol-standard, and sometimes teaches the patrol. Each patrol chooses its own meeting place and arranges it how it likes. At patrol meetings the badge work and other easy work is done.

As soon as possible everything suggesting a Sunday School was swept away and our procedure is now as follows:

Seats are arranged in a hollow square, and at the sound of the bugle or whistle the whole company falls in round the square, properly standing at ease, the sergeant in the centre holding the banner and the leaders standing in front of their patrols with their standards.

We never begin with a hymn. Hymns are like war dances, of great value in letting off high spirits. We begin with an exercise in self-control— a minute's complete silence, in which no one moves an inch. A word or two from the Superior (myself) help to direct the thoughts, then the Superior says the opening words of the Lord's Prayer, each Soldier of the Cross saying the rest secretly. The parade therefore goes like this:

Let us all say together in whose Name we meet.
All. In the Name of the Father . . .

Now we will have the Silence.

℣. The Lord is in His Holy Temple.
℟. Let all the earth keep silence before Him.

Silence.

Our Father . . .
℣. And lead us not into temptation.
℟. But deliver us from evil.

Now let us repeat our oath together . . .

Now hear the Law of God. (*The Sergeant repeats the Law*).

Prayer. Almighty God, we beseech Thee to bless all Christians everywhere, especially the Soldiers of the Cross. Give us grace to fear Thee and to be fearless, to serve Thee and to be Thy fellow-workers, and give us grace to keep our threefold vow, for Jesus Christ's sake.

Prayer for those in poverty, trouble and sickness.
Hymn.
Inspection by the Superior.
Superior's Yarn, the Company sitting.
Hymn.
The Patrol Leaders march off their Patrols to the Patrol Meetings.

The two criticisms we had to face at first were (1) that the test was too hard, and (2) that we should find ourselves in difficulties regarding those who failed to pass it. The criticisms have proved themselves to be practically baseless. Only two children have failed to secure the novice's badge. Making it hard to join has increased the desire to join, and we were not long in discovering the advantages of the new method, every detail of which had been modelled on the Boy Scout Movement. A magic change passed over the boys and girls, and we

found them sorry to leave at the end of an hour, or suggesting an additional meeting on a week-day. Their will and interest had become enlisted in the scheme, and they threw themselves into it.

By means of badges, and the patrol ritual, everything they learned was in some way connected with themselves, and they were therefore interested. Also, everyone of them started learning the Christian Faith again from the beginning, and was ready to answer questions on it. In the old system, if a new boy came to the Sunday School, he was put into whatever class his age dictated, and took on the work as he found it . . . it might be Amos or Jeremiah. With us he would have to begin at the beginning, and the sergeant or patrol-leader would take him in hand with the Novice Test.

The old prize system had long been rightly abandoned. The badge system gave every boy and girl a reward which was really earned and testified to work done. The attendance went up, collections went up, and the devotional atmosphere during prayer was remarkable. We had the children with us.

Space forbids my describing in detail the whole of our methods: how we act plays made up from such ready material as Kingsley's *Saint's Tragedy;* how we have turned the Catechism into a drama, with the soldiers having their parts; how we have a series of badges, obtainable on passing the requisite tests. Everything is practical, not least the teaching. Thus when we teach the duty of Church-work, we teach that weeding an old lady's garden or chopping her sticks is just as much Church-work as serving at the altar or ringing the bell, and our stories of the Saints are chosen to give attractive examples of lives devoted in the first place to the serving of God and then to the serving of man.

We have not found the cost of badges, standards, &c., a great obstacle. The standards we have made for ourselves, and as for badges and costumes, the collections taken up at our displays have always sufficed. But it is clear to me now, that from the beginning everything should have been home-made. Patrols of boys could have met on week-day nights to make standards, &c., and patrols of girls to make badges; and men and women belonging to the Church, who would shrink

from teaching a class, could be found to take charge. We are going to do this now, and we shall thus be able to work more adults into our Sunday School work. It must also be understood that this handcraft work is just as religious and more educational than learning a lesson. It is all part of the training of the whole personality.

As I look back on what we have achieved, I see that it is not only truer to the new principles of education as expressed (merely in one way) in the Boy Scout Movement, but it is also truer to Christianity itself. Christianity never consisted in sitting on a form and listening to a lesson, and then getting up and singing a hymn. Christianity presents itself to us as something to do, not something to learn, a life to take up, not a book to read; with its brotherhood, its oath, its law, its ritual and its initiation, it is itself the most perfect educational institution in the world. We are educated not by books, but by throwing ourselves into that communal life.

The Soldiers of the Cross is just one way by which that communal life in Christ is offered to the young believer. It is true he does not understand all this, but he is doing it, which is more important, and he is liking doing it, and it is educating him in what a Christian ought to know and to do for his soul's health. He is growing up in the sphere of Christ, and one day he will discover he knew Him all his life.

In the past, Christian teachers have made great mistakes, not only in trying to teach too much, but in confusing the little and the great. How much is necessary? And how much is just helpful? And how much is merely confusing? Charles Marson in *Huppim and Muppim* long ago criticized our diocesan syllabuses; but even he left no clear instructions as to what was that essence of Christianity which was so simple that even a child could very quickly and easily understand it. We have endeavoured in this scheme to put the essentials of Christianity thus clearly and simply before the child, in which task we have avoided anything original and stuck to the Prayer Book and the Catechism, and we have so arranged our scheme that these essentials are brought into the activities of the company every Sunday, and in an especially solemn way every time there is an admission to the Companionship or Novitiate.

After all, the object of the Sunday School is to teach boys and girls to be Christians, and our first object should be to get them to say their prayers, to come to church, and to do good turns. The method is by enlisting their interest and will, so that they pledge their honour. This must come first, and knowledge second.

It will thus be realized that the life of the company does not depend on the number of badges it gets, but on carrying out the Vow and the Law. It should be continually engaged in the service of God and men.

Outside the Church the company should be on the look-out for service. The Scout Movement is a witness to the way in which the practice of doing good turns may be carried on, and the boys and girls should be encouraged to do these for the sake of the Gospel. Entertainments for orphanages and hospitals, looking after the sick and old, are examples of such work, and if the regulation Sunday afternoon is suspended for the purpose, there is no harm done.

Sir Robert Baden-Powell thinks that woodcraft (or the study of nature and animals) is the easiest road to religion for a boy . . . that and the doing of good turns. But lectures on the wonders of creation are not what he means. One must get out into the woods and see for oneself. Experience proves this true: the most wonderful service I ever attended was a Communion Service in a Rover Camp facing the sunrise with the early birds still twittering in the pine-trees overhead.

I do not think the world will ever come to know God until in some such way it comes face to face with God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. All that was vital in monasticism belonged to the open air, and the hymns of the monks are full of the sunrise and the sunset. Monasticism failed for lack of fresh air. Children should learn all about the missionaries and hermits, who have found God in His temple not made with hands. Then they should go out into the country and do it themselves.

A day in the country means a lot to a child. A day in the country, or a night in camp would do wonders for the Soldiers of the Cross. If they went and set up their standards, and said their prayers, and did the work of the camp, and played games,

they would be learning a very real Christianity indeed; and then in the mid-day heat or round the camp-fire at night they would listen to the stories of King Arthur and his Knights, or better still to yarns about our Lord and His disciples, and resolve to do the farmer next door at least one good turn before they left.

I have not yet tried even half a day. We must get on to that next year. The company activities of this kind are more important, I think, than the badge work; but I do not regret having devoted a year and a half to that. We have worked out a solid and tried intellectual foundation, and a law and system to take into camp. As pioneers, we have had to go slowly.

May we hope that others will try and work as we are doing? All that has been attempted so far is a very literal imitation of the Scout Movement, even in detail; but the principles which underlie this movement can work themselves out in a hundred ways.

There is one thing needed: faith. Those who were at our first anniversary and saw the leaders quietly marching off their patrols, would hardly credit the uproar when we first got the patrol system going, and asked them to move forms where we wanted them. Much credit is due to the Sunday School teachers who lived through this period. So it is fair to warn experimenters that the transition may be uncomfortable; but even during this period the improvement and keenness in other ways is obvious.

They will begin by doing all these things badly. Let us cheer up, and remember what Mr. G. K. Chesterton says: 'If a thing is worth doing, it is worth doing badly.' Children must begin by doing things badly; they like it, and call it playing at it; and by doing it, they learn to do things well.

Further, having got your drill and prayers perfect, do not expect that everything else will go in the same way. The patrol work, for instance, may be bad, and the boys inattentive; this is probably all part of the process of growth and education. Let it grow.

Perhaps you give drawing as patrol work: they may be asked to design a new badge. You will be irritated because they go at it partially and fitfully; do not worry too much.

That is how God made a boy. Help him, and give suggestions, and leave him. But make all your own ceremonial part absolutely perfect; Baden-Powell defines discipline as quick obedience in small details.

Small details are everything to a child: great principles nothing. Perhaps you will even think, after reading this, that it is only playing at religion. You are right. But is not that what God created children to do? And are not you to receive the Kingdom of Heaven after their manner?

> 'For it was not that we lacked memory, or intellect, which it was Thy will, Lord, that we should have, sufficient for our age; but it delighted us to play, and we were punished for it by those who were doing just such things themselves. But the trifles in which our elders were engaged they called business; while those of children, though of exactly the same nature, are punished by their elders; and nobody pities the boys . . .'—St. Augustine, *Confessions* I, x.

Correspondence on the details of this scheme or similar schemes will be welcomed by the author, and should be addressed directly to him at the Vicarage, Lincoln, Canterbury, New Zealand.—ED., *M.C.*

THE ARCHDEACON OF STAFFORD'S CONFERENCE

The following findings of a private conference, presided over by the Archdeacon of Stafford, have just been received. We print them without comment, but hope to deal with the issues raised in our next number.

We, the undersigned, met in conference on October 25th, at Lichfield, to consider the Cambridge Conference of Modern Churchmen as reported in the *Modern Churchman* for September. After careful discussion we desire to place on record the following conclusions:

1. While profoundly disagreeing with many of the views expressed at the Cambridge Conference and with much of the philosophy which lies behind them, we regard the whole conference as an honest and reverent attempt to draw men to all truth.

2. We considered the three desiderata formulated by Mr. Major in his introduction (pp. 194—5), and are of opinion: (*a*) That, while we recognize as right the use of modern methods of historical criticism as applied to Holy Scripture, we are unable to pass any clear judgment on the Modernists' view of what constitutes a valid Scriptural proof until they have made more clear what value, if any, they think should be given to the Johannine and Pauline writings in matters of (i) history and (ii) doctrine. (*b*) That, inasmuch as any organized community must have certain conditions of membership, we do not think the appeal to authority can ever be altogether dispensed with. Mr. Major himself apparently accepts this proposition, as in the *Modern Churchman* for October he says 'it may be the duty of the Church authorities to deprive' the Modernist if he is led 'as the result of his loyalty to truth' 'into teaching what is in conflict with Church tradition.' But we recognize as just the Modernist claim that critics should meet their theories not by condem-

nation, but by attempted refutation, showing *why* they are wrong rather than telling them they are wrong. (*c*) That we accept unreservedly the claim that 'truth must be accepted in scorn of consequences.'

3. We believe that the Chalcedonian Definition, while ruling out certain false lines of approach, definitely 'kept open the central problem of Christian theology' (*i.e. how* our Lord can be both perfect God and perfect Man) 'for future ages.' It follows from this that loyalty to decisions of the past is in no way inconsistent with theological progress.

4. We believe that the *content* of the past decisions of the Church is true and should be conserved, but we have no objection to a re-statement of the faith in new *terminology*, provided that the content is fully preserved in the new expression.

5. We accept as true what seems to be the main positive contribution of the conference, *viz.* the fundamental kinship between God and Man. But we think that to preserve the due proportion of the faith this must be balanced by the correlative truth of the essential difference between Creator and creature. Some at least of us regard this as a vital presupposition of worship.

(Signed)

C. E. Blakeway, D.D., Archdeacon of Stafford; Douglas H. Crick, B.A., Vicar of Wednesbury; J. W. Dixon, Prebendary of Lichfield and Rector of Darlaston; H. B. Freeman, M.A., Vicar of Burton-on-Trent; Edgar Hartill, M.A., Vicar of Penn; Percy Hartill, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield; Arthur Paice, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield and Vicar of St. Mary's, Lichfield; Alfred Penny, M.A., Canon of Lichfield; B. F. Relton, M.A., Vicar of Walsall; Henry V. Stuart, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield and Rector of Stoke-on-Trent; E. W. Winstanley, D.D. (Cantab).

One member of the conference felt himself unable to sign this statement.

BOOK NOTICES

CHRISTIANITY IN ITS MODERN EXPRESSION*

'The question is: What re-valuation of Jesus is necessary to make him serviceable in the life of the modern man?'

This question, put by the late Prof. George Burman Foster, of Chicago, author of the well-known work, *The Finality of the Christian Religion*, is *the* religious question of our day. Compared with it others are insignificant. And it is over this issue that Christians are divided into two conflicting camps. The only differences worth mentioning nowadays are between the Modernists and the Traditionalists. The old classifications—Catholic and Protestant, Church and Dissent—may survive in our vocabularies, but they are already obsolete. The spirit is departed, or departing, from them; they move us no more.

The contest is now between those who claim, and those who refuse, to re-interpret Jesus to an age to which He has become, to use the significant phrase of Schweitzer, 'a stranger and an enigma.'

The two conflicting attitudes depend on, and issue logically from, two diverse views of what we call *dogma*. For the Traditionalist, dogma is

* *Christianity in its Modern Expression*, by George Burman Foster. Macmillan and Co., New York, 14/- net.

the soul of religion; for the Modernist, dogma is the clothing which religion wears. For the one, dogma is *primary;* for the other it is always *secondary*. For the first, it is permanent and divine; for the second, it is changing and human. The Traditionalist envisages a divinely and supernaturally revealed *corpus* of theology which is changeless, and only admits of development by making explicit what was already implicit. The Modernist finds in the history of theology a succession of attempts on the part of the human mind to give expression to certain experiences, feelings, and convictions about the meaning of existence and its method. None of these attempts, however bold, successful, or ingenious, can the Modernist regard as final—for knowledge and experience grow, men's minds and categories change; and these being the moulds of our thought, it follows that the shapes which our thought takes change perpetually from generation to generation.

So that the difference between Traditionalist and Modernist is not a mere dispute over historical or philosophical facts or speculations, *but a fundamental divergence of attitude.* The two see the world of religious history, and of present religious experience, through different spectacles. An impassable gulf seems to subsist between them; they speak in mutually unintelligible tongues.

The really interesting feature of the situation is that the Traditionalists display a singular ignorance of history—especially the history of the development of dogma. For the theology they represent as final, is itself the product of a process of accommodation, is itself the attempt, or a series of attempts, to re-interpret Jesus and the Christ-experience to the world. Those who are now regarded as the foundation-stones of an immoveable and inflexible orthodoxy, were in their day themselves innovators of a bold and even dangerous type. Athanasius *contra mundum,* the champion of Nicene orthodoxy, and Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, the creator of mediaeval Catholic theology and the final Roman Catholic authority to-day, must be assigned to this sinister category. The only thing that prevented the encyclopaedic Dominican from becoming the blackest of heresiarchs was (perhaps the best of all reasons) his success. He triumphantly re-interpreted Christianity in terms of a philosophy hitherto regarded, and not without reason, as fundamentally heterodox. He baptized Aristotle into Christ. Even the liberal Raymond Lull shuddered at the thought.

The particular re-interpretation suggested by Prof. Burman Foster may be seen in the following characteristic passage:

> 'Is the solution to be found in a movement forward from a Christocentric theology to a theocentric theology, wherein God shall be interpreted in terms of the personality of Jesus? The cry of the soul is . . . for the living God, not a God in the past, but a present accessible God.
>
> 'Yet that God must not be interpreted in terms of any other than Jesus Christ, the best we know. Perhaps it would be good enough to interpret that God in terms of an ideal of which there is no counterpart in historic reality; but it is better if we can find a real counterpart, and if Jesus' inner purpose of will can be made the basis of the interpretation. This idea of God in Jesus and Jesus in God will make the Christian religion cosmopolitan, as the Logos religion was at an earlier time. Supplementing the watchword, "Back to Jesus," with this other, "Back from Jesus to God'; interpreting God in terms of Jesus . . . our theology, being theocentric as well as Christian, will once again win the world.' (p. 165.)

This passage expresses a feeling which is fairly widespread—a conviction (as Prof. Foster elsewhere puts it) that 'the essential thing in the Christian faith in Jesus is that God is as good as Jesus is, even though appearances may sometimes be to the contrary.' Such a belief is, no doubt, hard: but if it can only be attained, it solves the problem of life, for

> 'If the will at the heart of things is, in its attitude towards us, as good as the will of Jesus, I can bury my child, pass through invalidism, lose my fortune, be maligned, and die forgotten before I die . . . If God is truly represented by the will of Jesus, made omnipotent, what need I fear?'

It may be that the difficulties in the way of belief arise from a certain spiritual shallowness which has developed amongst us:

> 'Religion has lost its depths, we are distraught. Religion has become a multiplicity of things to be done. Our weakness to-day is that we have lost our *souls*. We must conquer and regain an inner world.'

The question is worth asking, too, whether traditional conceptions of the miraculous, together with the complementary view of God, may not have stood, and still stand, in the way of a faith of the kind that we most need. A pertinent question is put by our author when he says:

> 'The God who would change water into wine for the sake of a wedding, but would not suspend the nature of fire to save little children from being burned to death, is not a moral God from the point of view of the modern man, and there is no use in trying to make him believe it.' (p. 112.)

And this passage suggests another classification of theologians in addition to that which divides them into modernists and traditionalists. For theologians may be divided into those who do, and those who do not, lay all the emphasis in religion upon certain specified events in past history—generally of a miraculous character. Of this latter class it has been said, and perhaps not unjustifiably, that:

> 'Their passion for the facts which are objective, isolated, and past, prevents them from seeing the facts which are eternal and spiritual. They can only adore what comes to them from without. As soon as their dramaturgy is interpreted symbolically, all seems to them lost. They must have their local prodigies—their vanished unverifiable miracles, because for them the divine is there and only there.'*

It has been suggested, and with some appearance of truth, that the Latin mind is characterised by a tendency towards this dogmatic supernaturalism. It is doomed to petrify its abstractions and to make everything as objective as possible; whereas the Teutonic mind sees things differently, and *sub specie aeternitatis*. For it, ideals rather than facts are the reality, and a fact is only of importance because it symbolises a spiritual or moral truth. The view may be found expressed at large in Carlyle; *Sartor Resartus* is an elaboration of it, and Professor Burman Foster belongs to the same school; or to speak more accurately, has the same temper of mind as Teufelsdroch. But then there is always the question how far religion can be based on conceptions of this kind. The question is pertinent:

> 'Can religion do without mythology? Can we conquer with the plain, simple categories of forgiveness, humility, righteousness, &c.?'

* Amiel's *Journal*. Eng. Trans., p. 194.

In the case of primitive Christianity, 'Paul conquered with the cosmic Messiah, not with the historic Jesus . . . It was drama that did the work, not the Sermon on the Mount.' We are inclined to think it was by means of both, yet it is a difficult problem, and only the future can show whether religion is able to dispense with mythology, and yet survive as a living force among the generality of men and women. Yet there is one thing that rivals even miracle in the appeal it makes; and that is the appeal of human personality—this is the central interest of mankind. And it is perhaps along these lines that interest can be focussed again on Christianity.

> 'I am more and more struck with the way Jesus falls in line with humanism. And the modern type of Christianity is Christian humanism. Once, people made little of man, in order to make much of God. Now we must make much of man, if we are to make much of God. And as for Jesus Christ, we must insist on His humanity, if we are to see His dignity. The old view was that, in spite of His humanity, He was great. The modern view is that through His humanity He was great.'

Ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt. The Fates are the Spirit of Truth. Even the theologians must move along. They may not know they are moving, but the progress to which we are insensible is not the less real. The convinced traditionalist wakes up one day to find himself standing where the modernist of his youth stood. Even in theology πάντα ῥεῖ, and we cannot step twice into the same stream.

This is an encouraging and inspiring book, and we are grateful to Professor Douglas Clyde Macintosh for editing it. This posthumous work is a fit sequel to *The Finality of the Christian Religion.*

J. C. HARDWICK.

DR. GLOVER'S LATEST VOLUME.*

If this collection of papers from the pen of Dr. T. R. Glover may be rightly termed a volume of sermons, it must be admitted on the one hand that we have seldom if ever listened to sermons quite of this type, while on the other hand we might say with some emphasis that we very much wish we *had.* Readers of *The Jesus of History* and *Jesus in the Experience of Men* will be already familiar with their author's method and style. But the present book will give an altogether new idea of Dr. Glover's amazing versatility. We knew from his pictures of the life and teaching of Jesus how minute details of phrase, delicate touches of description or characterisation (unnoticed by the casual reader) could be laid under contribution for the better understanding of a scene or parable. This we knew, and we find the same method, the same care, the same sureness of touch applied now to the study of the Old Testament. Jeremiah stands out before us as a real person, human, clear-cut, arresting. The *Ancient Hymn of Hate* of the Babylonian Exiles (Psalm 137) speaks with a new poignancy under the force of the suggestion that the singer had seen his own child hurled against the stones of Jerusalem by some brutal soldier. The treatment of New Testament subjects is equally suggestive. The paper on *The Training of Nazareth* reminds us frequently of the early chapters of *The Jesus of History,* but the writer is dominated by a new purpose—that of demolishing what to him are the fanciful and artificial theories of the Apocalyptic School. *The Talents* is of value in its suggestion that the lord of the servants is drawn from daily life, and

* *The Pilgrim,* by T. R. Glover. S.C.M., 1921. Price 6/- net.

that the treatment meted out to the three servants, whether of lavish reward or contemptuous dismissal, is entirely in line with the known policy of the House of Herod. The attempted reconstruction of the events which occurred on the last evening of our Lord's life has the merit of bringing into strong relief the craving for human sympathy which Jesus manifested, and the relations of closest intimacy which existed between the Master and his friends.

The papers on *The Holy Spirit* and *The Writer to the Hebrews* are more definitely essays, and summon us to leave the armchair by the fire, where we have sat contentedly hitherto, and to sit at the table armed with a pencil and an alert mind. In the latter essay we have an admirable example of the valuable results which may follow the resolution to leave commentaries behind and to concentrate the attention upon the writer himself—his words and meaning; in the former we see, delineated by a master hand, the upward progress of a great conception from its crude and non-moral beginnings in the remote past to its full maturity as a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith. *The Religion of Martin Luther* is a vigorous attempt to vindicate the reformer against traducers by reference to the man himself as he is revealed in the intimacies of friendly talk. In Dr. Glover, Luther finds a staunch champion, though one perhaps whose advocacy is somewhat weakened by a seeming lack of appreciation of those more mystical types of faith for which Luther, like Wesley after him, had but little sympathy and, should we not say? little understanding also.

The paper entitled *The Pilgrim,* from which the whole book gets its name, together with that on *A Lost Article of Faith,* serve a useful function in laying a needed emphasis on the fact that while we have achieved —and rightly achieved—a hard-won freedom from false other-worldliness and the tyranny of a God reminiscent rather of some savage Moloch than of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet there is a Christian other-worldliness which we discard at our peril, and 'the good-fellow God' is as far from reality and as much a baseless invention of the human mind as his forbidding antithesis.

For sheer beauty and charm of expression *The Statue of the Good Shepherd* perhaps outstrips anything that Dr. Glover has ever written. He calls it 'the page of a scrap-book,' but paste and scissors are here used with such a degree of consummate skill that 'scrappiness' is entirely wanting from the finished product. W. Maurice Pryke.

A SAINT OF MODERN DAYS.*

It is a pity that the word saint has acquired for the modern man what someone has recently called 'an implication of anaemia and irrelevance.' So much is this the case that it is with some measure of trepidation that we venture to use it of the subject of this memoir from the pen of Mr. Edwyn Bevan. And yet the word is too good to lose, and to anyone whose privilege it was to know Leslie Johnston—manly, vigorous, outspoken of speech, vehement sometimes to the verge of intolerance in his comments on opinions not in line with his own—the word saint as applied to him will certainly carry with it no suggestion of anaemia; nor could it be said, if 'saint' bears its New Testament sense, of one whose life is dedicated to the service of Christ, that its use is in any degree irrelevant or conventional.

* *A Memoir of Leslie Johnston*, by Edwyn Bevan. S.C.M., 1921. Price 7/6 net.

Mr. Bevan has given us this collection of letters, together with a brief sketch of their writer's life and work up to the time of his death in France in 1915, as a loving tribute from the hand of an older man to the memory of the younger who was his friend. The greater part of the letters were written to the author of the memoir. The interest of these informal and entirely intimate utterances which are here offered to a larger public will be evident to every reader; but to those closely associated with the Oxford of 1914, and to whom almost every name occurring in the letters will be familiar, the picture presented by the earlier letters will convey an impression poignantly vivid of a life and outlook which in some, at any rate, of its essential features, has been destroyed for ever by the war.

The impression which the letters give is of a man who attained his ends by sheer obstinate resolution and strength of will. The character of the undergraduate and college tutor retained, his friend tells us, nothing of that touch of puritan hardness which marked the outlook of the public school boy. But the dogged determination remained, and was transformed into a splendid steadfastness of purpose which helped Johnston to face with cheerfulness the rigour and discomfort of life in the trenches. Life for him could never have been simple or easy. Problems bulked too large and clamoured insistently for solution. A love of institutional religion (fostered by his Cuddesdon home), a training in philosophy, an enthusiastic admiration for the aims and ideals represented by the Student Christian Movement, an intense sympathy with the point of view of the ordinary man (he actually contemplated getting the job of a coalheaver during a long vacation)—all these had their contribution to make to his personality, and the effort to fuse them into an adequate working philosophy of life and religion made of existence a strenuous if delightful enterprise.

With things German, even at their best, Johnston was never wholly sympathetic. He studied at Marburg in 1909, and to one who followed him there at the end of the same year, staying actually with the very people with whom he stayed, his impressions, while naturally of much interest, yet leave the conviction that a sympathetic judgment of the foreigner was scarcely, at that period at any rate, his strongest point. It is true that we were entirely at one in an enthusiastic admiration for the lady who was our hostess. She for her part held Leslie in most affectionate regard, referring constantly to *der liebe Herr Johnston—ein sehr netter Mensch.*

While Johnston grew increasingly sympathetic towards the Modern Churchman, the letters contain some very trenchant, and in some cases at least unduly harsh comments upon the work of living writers, comments which Mr. Bevan would perhaps have done well to omit. This question with reference to Liberal Churchmen: 'Don't you feel repelled by their one infallible dogma—that there is no infallibility, but that they're nearer it than anyone else?' is, however, at least relevant enough to deserve quotation.

Johnston's attitude to the war was that of very many placed as he was in 1914. However hateful, however terrible, the thing had to be gone through with. For him, as for Whittier's hero, when the call came to renounce 'the dreams of lettered ease,' to set aside 'the scholar's promise'—in Johnston's case his work as a scholar was of no mean order and the promise was abundant—there was no thought of hesitation. 'The rights of man are more than these. He heard and answered: "Here am

I.'' He died fittingly enough in the desperate attempt to rescue a wounded man. The reader will close the book, as he will have closed many which tell an essentially similar story, with a renewed sense of almost staggering loss, and a heightened realisation of 'the responsibility of surviving.'

W. MAURICE PRYKE.

BROADWAYS.*

We spent an interesting hour reading and discussing Mr. Guy Kendall's modern version of Bishop Blougram. Some would perhaps regard it as a clever parody of Browning, but it is not a parody. It is an analysis of the convictions and preferences of a modern Broad Church canon—pre-eminently a man of culture and of insight, but not of strong moral feeling or of vigorous religious enthusiasm. He loves the aesthetic side of the Church's life, and perceives how intimately it is interwoven with the Church's tradition; yet while ready to observe the Church's rule, he is unable to accept the Church's formularies in any but a symbolic sense. This does not seem to him any reason for resigning his canonry nor for seeking to alter the Church's services by substituting crude and *jejune* modern compositions in their place. The creed for him is not primarily the recital of a series of facts, but the adumbration of vast, incomprehensible, eternal spiritual verities:

'I'll test by this your point about the creeds.
I say or sing the words in monotone;
I cross myself, the people say 'Amen,'
And think they've set the seal on so much fact.
(Archbishops, it would seem, think much the same.)
. . . . To me that Credo
Means things that far transcend all words or music,
Vast cosmic happenings, chaos, matter, spirit,
The Word made flesh, incarnate through all ages
Even had the Carpenter divine not lived;
And must not Christ Himself the reign at last
Yield . . . .
Did not Paul say it? Origen alone
Read, marked, digested it, and so was branded
A heretic for his wisdom. That's their way!
Well then, I bow the knee and cross myself,
And set the seal to—no historic fact,
Not one born fatherless:—he may have been,
May not (to me the not's more probable)
Nor that he left the grave and rose to heaven
With bones and all pertaining to our nature
(Unpauline, though it's in the Articles),
But—worlds beyond all worlds, aeons of aeons,
Eternal God-Creator, and God's Love,
Slain from the first foundations of the world,
Atoning by creation of more love.
—Now tell me, where's the heresy in that?'

We leave the question with our readers.

H.D.A.M.

* *Broadways, or The Blougram of our Day*, by Guy Kendall. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1921); price 2/- net.

CORRESPONDENCE

MODERNISM.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

I have read with great interest the letter of Dr. Charles Harris. Like him, I am a constant but critical reader of the *Modern Churchman.* I should certainly not call myself 'a Modernist,' partly because I dislike what seem to me ways of saying, 'I am of Paul,' or 'of Cephas,' or 'of Apollos.' And I could perhaps pick holes for myself in the sentence of yours which your correspondent criticizes, if you presented it as a formulary for subscription, which you do not. But, with entire respect for the ability and for the temper which your correspondent shows, I should much like to know what is the real subject of anxiety which caused him to write, and what is his practical aim.

He quotes from you a sentence which relates exclusively to the results of 'reverent' research on the part of men who look for the 'revelation of the Holy Spirit.' He does not seem to doubt the sincerity of your words. But he asks whether you are claiming 'liberty within the Church' to teach a number of things of which atheism and community of wives are examples. Such a question in reference to your sentence is a good enough piece of Socratic dialectic, and such dialectic would have its uses in a time of unlimited leisure, but Dr. Harris is a capable writer and knows quite well that reverent research, seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, does not tend towards atheism or community of wives. I conjecture that his serious concern is with belief in the Incarnation, to which also his question refers.

But by belief in the Incarnation I understand the belief 'that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God is God and Man,'—(it is possible that Dr. Harris is referring to a belief other than this, but I do not think so since he defines denial of the Incarnation as Unitarianism). Now free and serious study—(free since it could not otherwise be serious)—of the meaning and origin of Christian belief has been a powerful agent in strengthening belief in the Incarnation, both in the minds of the comparatively few who can be students at all, and through them in the minds of English people generally. This statement can hardly surprise Dr. Harris, for he is unlikely to admit that vital Christian belief is vulnerable by real study, nor will he, I think, deny that God really is, as it has been written, 'a rewarder of them that seek Him.' My own experience and observation make me certain that the influence of the study in question is as I have stated. To that study many minds drawn from many schools have contributed, and while some of the great contributors have been men to whom Dr. Harris would surely not apply the term 'Modernist,' there are not a few of them to whom I think he would. They are all workers in one vineyard.

Thus, while it would be impertinent to press your courteous correspondent for any answer, he will perhaps understand the wonder with which a mere 'Christian in the street' reads his letter. What is the substantial interest of a living Christianity for which he feels alarmed when he contemplates that somewhat loosely definable tendency in ecclesiastical life to which the name 'Modernism' is applied? What is the exact reason why he cannot be content to teach the truth as he

sees it as well as he can, but must raise questions about 'liberty within the Church,' pointing, if they mean anything, to the extrusion of some preachers from the pulpit and the repelling of some laymen from the Altar?

If I may conclude with one criticism of my own upon the sentence of yours which alarms Dr. Harris, it must concern the emphasis which you seem to place on research. The particular enquiries which this term suggests form but one element in the scholarly study of the literature of Christianity. And this study itself is both idle and apt to be smitten with fatuity, when not inspired throughout by the question, which is a question for the unlearned no less than the learned, 'can I not find in Jesus Christ the guide of my daily life?' This, of course, you will feel as strongly as I do.

EATON SQUARE, S.W., CHARNWOOD.
October 28th, 1921.

[We hold that there is in the case of the Christian dogmas a threefold test—rational, moral, spiritual. We did not mean by research a purely intellectual process.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

THE DEITY OF OUR LORD.

I venture to suggest the following considerations in justification of the use of the word 'Deity' to describe that which is divine in the Person of Jesus Christ.

(*a*) Christian Theology is, or ought to be, the formulation of the specifically Christian religious experience. That experience is based on the revelation of the nature and character of God mediated to us through the historical personality of Jesus of Nazareth; it culminates in the assurance that what is revealed in the character, words and works of Jesus is the very essence, the very life of God Himself, albeit energising *sub specie humanitatis*. If Christian faith sees in Christ not merely an act of God, but God acting, not merely the supreme human Revealer of God, but God revealing Himself, not merely man reconciled, but God reconciling, then it is a reasonable statement of the implications of Christian experience to maintain that the Divine Life manifested and energising in Jesus is identical in essence with the Divine Life of God in Himself: that Jesus is not only ἔνθεος ἄνθρωπος but also ἔνανθρωπος θέος. To express this conviction we need the highest term available, and if 'Deity' be a higher term than 'Divinity,' then Deity is the term to use, remembering always that for Christian thought the essence of Deity is Love.

(*b*) It is argued that because the Jesus of History was not omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, that because He distinguished Himself in prayer and teaching from God His Father, and was inspired by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, therefore the term Deity cannot properly be predicated of Him. But surely this is to beg the whole question of the possibility of a real Incarnation. For the very conditions of a real Incarnation themselves exclude the possibility of these attributes of Deity operating in the Incarnate Personality; an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent man is a contradiction in terms: these attributes as such cannot become Incarnate. But is it therefore to be thought impossible that the Logos of God (that self-expressing, self-revealing Element which is an essential constituent of the Being of a Personal God) should become truly man, and that the supreme and adequate *Self*-revelation of God should be a morally perfect human personality? Only, I submit, if God is Love. But the very essence of the God revealed in Jesus Christ is Love; and to assert that

the God who is Love cannot become incarnate is to put limits to the omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence of Deity. Christian faith sees God's own infinite power, wisdom and presence focussed and concentrated in a genuinely human life, and a genuinely human experience, and recognises therein the climax of God's characteristic activity of redemptive self-revelation. But how could God have made His own a complete and perfect human experience unless it included a real human *religious* experience? That Jesus prayed to one God, and addressed Him as His God and His Father, is not in itself any disproof of His own essential Deity, as the Incarnate Logos of the God who is Love.

(*c*) The consciousness of an unique and perfect personal relationship to the Father and of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is the dominating characteristic of our Lord's self-consciousness, as it is portrayed for us in the Synoptic Gospels. That the Church in full view of this fact should assert the Deity of Christ may be further explained and defended on lines recently suggested to us by Professor C. C. J. Webb in his Gifford Lectures (*God and Personality*, p. 182, &c.). Should not the personal communion with God, spirit with spirit, which is for Christian thought the consummation of the religious life, be regarded as belonging to the true nature of God Himself? Should we not believe that in its ideal and archtype, Jesus Christ, this '*mutuum commercium*' is not outside of, and additional to, the inner life of Deity, but is contained within the circle of its perfect unity as an essential element of the Divine Being? And is it not into a fellowship in the very life of God that Christians are being raised by the indwelling of the Spirit of that life, which proceeds from the Father through the Son? (*cf.* I John i, 1—4).

(*d*) By asserting the Deity of Jesus Christ the Church maintains the absoluteness and finality of the Divine Revelation and Redemption offered to the world in and through Him and the Holy Spirit. The very challenge of the word itself expresses the assurance that in and through Christ we are brought into true and personal contact with the True and Personal God.

The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were formulated by the Church in its determination to do justice to all the complementary elements of Christian religious experience. I personally see no reason why Modernists as well as Traditionalists should not find in them a system of doctrine more capable than any other hitherto devised of holding together in all its fulness what is revealed and imparted to us in the Person of Jesus Christ, True God and True Man.

BIRCH-IN-RUSHOLME RECTORY,
October 30th, 1921.

R. G. PARSONS.

BISHOP GORE'S CRITICISM OF THE CONFERENCE.

SIR,

I am studying theology, but am only a beginner. I should, therefore, be very grateful for help in answering the following two series of questions which occurred to me on reading what you said of Bishop Gore's criticism of the Cambridge Conference :—

(1) Is hatred imperfect love, and therefore different from it only in degree? Is falsehood imperfect truth, and therefore different from it only in degree? If in these cases the difference is not merely one of degree, are beings in whose nature hatred and falsehood exist, or have existed, different only in degree from a Being in Whom they never could exist? Is not the distinction between the Purifier and the purified a moral

distinction analagous to the distinction—which is not a moral one—between Creator and creature? And is it not also a distinction which is not only one of degree?

(2) Is sinlessness superhuman? If we think we have discovered that our Lord's human life was sinless, have we discovered something in His human life which was superhuman, and therefore 'a flaw in the Incarnation?'

LETCHWORTH. E. M. HUTTON.

24th October, 1921.

[It is impossible in so brief a space to give adequate answers. We would suggest the following considerations:—

(1) The difference between a difference in degree and a difference in kind is that the first can be reduced until there is no difference at all, but the second is fixed. The difference between truth and falsehood, which are abstract ideas, is a difference in kind: it is fixed or absolute. For moral beings truth and falsehood can never become identical. Of course a particular falsehood may have more or less truth in it, but that does not bring truth and falsehood nearer to each other in nature, any more than you can make gold of the nature of copper by combining copper with gold to make sovereigns. The same is true of love and hatred.

(2) The objection to teaching that the difference between creator and creature (which is only one aspect of the difference between God and man) is *the* fundamental difference which entitles God to human worship, is that it encourages men to think of God primarily as Almighty and to worship Him as Almighty, whereas we ought to think of Him primarily as the Eternal Goodness and worship Him for that reason. Power, although this is not the popular view, is not adorable, but goodness is.

(3) We ought not to think of sinlessness as superhuman: we ought to regard it as the ideal human state, and look forward to its attainment. The command: 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect,' is doubtless given because it is attainable—in and through Christ.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR, A SIMPLE CREED.

Some time ago while on a tour in the Sahara Desert I had an interesting conversation with a learned and pious Marabout. We were discussing the faith of Islam, and I remarked that the problem of how to get the men to church which puzzled us in England seemed unknown in the East, where the men filled the Mosques not merely once a week but daily. After listening to the assertion of the Marabout that 'our religion is absolutely true,' I asked, 'Have you studied the Christian religion?' He at once replied, 'Yes, but it cannot be true, as you have at least three gods.' 'Not so,' I answered, 'for our creed begins with the assertion, 'I believe in ONE God.' He replied as follows: 'You Christians have corrupted the original Gospels. When Jesus ('Isá 'l Masīh) (on whom be peace, for He was of our faith and not of yours!) was on earth you say that He was not merely man, but God: and yet when His disciples said, "Teach us to pray," He said, "When you pray say, Our Father which art in heaven." Very well: so there was one God on earth and another in heaven. Another God, who is not either the Father in heaven or the Son, you call the Holy Spirit. So you have three Gods; and the Catholics, who are the most numerous body of Christians, make the mother of 'Isá to be a goddess, and also worship many saints. So

you have not One God, but three at least; and may He Who is alon exalted pardon and enlighten you.' I tried to explain that the thre Persons of the Trinity had one and the same Divine Nature, but h insisted that three Divine Persons must be three Gods, and I felt i better to change the subject, for there flashed into my mind the words o a Broad-Church friend who said that two verses of the Athanasian Cree should be recast and assert that 'Like as we are compelled by th Christian verity to acknowledge three Gods, so are we forbidden by th Catholic Religion . . . to say so.'

The Marabout ended by saying that a really Christian creed would b brief, and the same as that of their *Kalimah,* only substituting *'Isá* fo Muhammad, 'There is no God but God, and 'Isá is the Apostle of God. I should like to know how a Modernist Churchman would have set abou the conversion of my friendly Marabout, for I confess that he carried m out of my depth, and that I was not able to present the truth to him in way to carry conviction.

October 25th, 1921. ANGLO-CATHOLIC.

[In a footnote we can hardly produce an apologetic for the conversio of Islam. In similar circumstances, we should frankly confess to ou interlocutor that there had been much corruption of the simple creed o Jesus, and that the popular belief in three Gods was such a corruption We should then proceed to say that the right Christian belief is no that Jesus is a God, but that Jesus is God and Man, and that thi affirmation is the way by which we teach that the Divine Nature is tha which we see in Jesus, and love and worship in Jesus; and also that th Spirit which comes into the hearts and transforms the characters of thos who really believe in Jesus is also the Spirit of God Himself. It is thi faith in One God made known to us in Father, Son and Holy Spirit whic is the New Testament doctrine of God, and not the popular belief tha there are three Gods. The Christian Creed we should proceed to add ha several advantages over the Creed of Islam—

(1) It makes God better known to us. Allah is largely an unknow God compared with the Father of Jesus Christ.

(2) It brings God closer to us: 'Closer is He than breathing, Neare than hands and feet.' Allah is a distant Being dwelling in th sky. The Christian God is transcendent, immanent and incar nate.

(3) It teaches us that we are sons of God, partakers of the Divin Nature, whereas in Muhammad's Creed men are but Allah' slaves or soldiers.

But we would add that although we believe the Christian theology t be superior to the theology of Islam, it is in Christian ethical ideals, th necessary correlatives of its creed, that the superiority of Christianity i most clearly seen. We may not develop this here, however. I our Preface to the Cambridge Conference papers, we urged that Christology such as the more important of those papers pointed to, wa needful if the East was to become Christian. Our correspondent's lett confirms our conviction. We suppose that neither he nor the Marabou would have found any difficulty in saying the Lord's Prayer together?— ED., *M.C.*]

The next Number of the *Modern Churchman* will be a doubl Number. In consequence there will not be a January issue.

COMMUNION AND FELLOWSHIP:

Dedicated to those who have passed Beyond the Veil.

By H. A. DALLAS.

Introduction by Sir W. F. BARRETT, F.R.S.

POST FREE, **2s. 2d.**

The aim: To realise, by prayer, unbroken fellowship with friends in the Unseen.

MESSRS. RIDER & SON, LTD., Paternoster Row, E.C. 4,
and from the AUTHOR, Innisfail, Crawley, Sussex.

J. WIPPELL & Co., Ltd.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART WORKERS.	MAKERS OF CLERICAL OUTFIT.
EMBROIDERY, WOOD, STONE, METAL, AND STAINED GLASS.	CLOTHING, HATS, CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, ROBES, HOODS, STOLES, VESTMENTS, ETC.

EXETER 55 & 56, HIGH STREET, AND CATHEDRAL YARD; & 4 & 5, DUNCANNON ST., CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

CASTELL & SON.

(ESTABLISHED 1846).

Tailors, Robe Makers, and Clerical Outfitters,

13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

Representatives travel regularly and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY.

Edited by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

3*s.* 6*d.* net each volume. In Paper Covers, 2*s.* net each.

I. The Faith of a Modern Churchman. By the Rev. Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., Canon of Ely. *Second Edition.*

'His simple statement of Christian doctrine is characterised by courage, wide learning, a broad point of view, and a very real reverence.'—*The Scotsman.*

II. The Genius of the English Church. By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

'We hope it may secure a very wide circle of readers.'—*The Spectator.*

III. The Evolution of the Christian Ministry. By the Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A. (sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford).

'We do not know anyone who could have written it better.'—*Expository Times.*

IV. Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods.

'His clear and reverent treatment of a difficult subject . . will commend the book to Churchmen of all schools.'—*Nation.*

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, LONDON, W.1.

CHRISTIANITY IN HISTORY.

A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT

BY

J. VERNON BARTLET AND A. J. CARLYLE.

Traces *inter alia* the development into, through, and beyond specific 'Catholicism,' towards modern Catholicity, so affording an historical background to Modernism.

MACMILLAN: pp. xx., 613, **14/-**.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.
Principal—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.
Chaplain—Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.

This Theological College is centrally situated and provides, in conjunction with the Oxford University Ordination Course with which it co-operates, an adequate modern training for Candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese.

The academic year consists of three terms of about nine weeks each. There is a fourth (but non-compulsory) term in the Long Vacation.

Graduates are eligible for admission and also Non-Graduate Service Candidates.

Applications for admission should be addressed to THE PRINCIPAL.